DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 612	RC 011 603

TITLE	Beyond Bows and Arrows. Resource Manual.
INSTITUTION	Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C. Bureau of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs.
PUB DATE	May 79
NOTE	148p.; Prepared for the Dallas Region "Symposium on the American Indian"
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	American History; *American Indian Culture; American Indian Education; *American Indians; Civil Rights; Education; Employment; Federal Government; *Federal Indian Relationship; *Government Role; Health; Housing; Population Trends; Reservations (Indian); *Treaties; *Tribes
IDENTIFIERS	*American Indian History; Bureau of Indian Affairs; Cultural Contributions

ABSTRACT

In spite of their visible prominence and influence on almost every aspect of our society, American Indians remain the least understood group of people. To acquaint symposium participants with the American Indian and to produce greater understanding, this resource manual documents the historical treatment and present status of Indians. Presented are: the constitutional status of American Indians, including sources of federal power, tribal sovereignty, powers of tribal self-government, hunting and fishing rights, domestic relations, taxation, legal status of Indian individuals, constitutional immunity, the 1968 Indian Bill of Rights, rights and privileges of state citizenship, and wardship; American Indian tribes, Eskimo and Aleut groups for which the Bureau of Indian Affairs has responsibility; federal Indian policies from the colonial period through the early 1970's; administrators of U.S. Federal Indian Policy; Commissioners of Indian Affairs from 1832 to the present; important dates in federal Indian relationships; labor statistics; employment; education; health; relevance of Indian life to civilization; housing; Indian population by regions; location of Indian lands and communities; and Indian tribes and organization, including names and addresses of each leader. (NEC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175612

RC 011603

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Cover: Will Sampson, Jr./Professional Actor

Cover Design: Jack Crittenden/Artist
Agency: Typography Plus

Layout: Doranne McLemore/Designer

The Intergovernmental

Personnel Programs Division

and the

Personnel Management Training Institute

Present

"BEYOND BOWS AND ARROWS"

Introduction

Dear Participant,

The Dallas Region "Symposium on the American Indian" has been in the planning stages for at least the last seven months. The Symposium was first mentioned to me over a year ago during my initial employment orientation by Mr. Tony Gutierrez. In all probability, the idea has been around within our region much longer. Tony and I have pursued our initial exchange of information enabling us to sponsor this Symposium with the ultimate goal of it being an educational experience for all participants.

In almost every aspect of today's society, some influence of the American Indian remains intact. One would not need to look far in any major city to locate a street named after some Indian Tribe. The automobile and aircraft industries have chosen names of Indian Tribes to label their products. The movie industry has been capitalizing on the American Indian for a long time. If one were to initiate a list denoting the influence of the American Indian, it would almost be endless. Yet, in spite of the visible prominence of the American Indian, we remain the least understood group of people. This conclusion is based on my personal experience of answering questions like: Do your folks still live in teepees? Do you receive a pay check from the government every month? What is it like being an Indian? or can you say something in Indian?

The purpose of the Symposium is to provide more information to further acquaint its participants on the American Indian. As an example and to answer a couple of the above mentioned questions, we plan to explain further that nothing can be said in Indian and that there is no such thing as feeling "Indian". The reason being that "Indian" is a legal term used to refer to several hundred tribes who, in many instances, have their own individual language. We propose to accomplish our purpose in two ways First, this Resource Manual will provide reading materials with other sources for more study. Secondly, our Symposium speakers are all from the American Indian Communities. They will be sharing information based on their individual experiences.

For any event of this magnitude, a host of people are needed to plan, coordinate and perform other numerous duties. A special acknowledgement is given to Mr. Edward Vela, Jr., Regional Director, Mr. Orman R. Wright, Chief, Intergovernmental Personnel Programs Division and Mr. Bill Etheridge, Jr., Director, Regional Training Center for the opportunity and support given in sponsoring this Symposium. A special thank you is extended to Mr. Tony Gutierrez Director, Personnel Management Institute, and his staff for the encouragement and cooperation given in the planning stages and in providing the technical expertise for getting the work completed. Ms. Jeanne Bowie, Mr. Jack Crittenden and my wife, Doranne, each deserve special acknowledgement for their contribution to the production of the printed materials.

It is my hope that our collective efforts will benefit each and every participant. I hope it will produce a greater understanding between our communities and will provide us with something that will be ours "as long as waters flow and the grass shall grow."

Sincerely,

Frank McLemore

Frank McLemore
Coordinator
Intergovernmental
Personnel
Programs Division

Table of Contents

1 United States Commission on Civil Rights
Staff Memorandum

11 American Indians and Their Federal Relationship
Plus a partial listing of other U.S. Indian Groups

32 Federal Indian Policies
from the Colonial Period through the early 1970's

56 Administrators of U.S. Federal Indian Policy

57 Commissioners of Indian Affairs
1832 to Present

59 Important Dates in Federal Indian Relationships

61 Federal Indian Policy and Labor Statistics: a review essay

73 Employment
Excerpt From American Indian Policy Review Commission Report

78 Education
Excerpt From American Indian Policy Review Commission Report

85 Health of the American Indian
Region VIII Task Force Report

114 Health
Excerpt From American Indian Policy Review Commission Report

116 Relevance of Indian Life to Civilization

121 Housing
Excerpt From American Indian Policy Review Commission Report

126 Indian Population by Regions
(1970 Census Statistics)

130 Indian Lands and Communities

131 Indian Tribes/Organizations
Dallas Region VI

135 Footnotes

144 Memos

United States Commission on Civil Rights

Staff Memorandum

March 1973

Washington, D.C. 20425

Constitutional Status of American Indians

Introduction

A thorough treatment of the constitutional status of American Indians would involve a complete analysis of the unique and complex field of Federal Indian law which cannot be adequately described merely by reference to the numerous treaties, statutory enactments of Congress, and court decisions or Federal administrative decisions.[1] The legal and political status of Indian tribes, the relationship of Indians to their tribes and to their States, and the relationship of tribes to the States and to the United States Government have long been issues of controversy. Tribes have traditionally been viewed by Federal courts as dependent or "tributary" nations possessed of limited elements of sovereignty and requiring Federal protection.[2] Congress has alternatively viewed tribes as sovereign political entities or as anachronisms which must eventually be extinguished. The result has been two conflicting Federal policies--separation and assimilation, one designed to protect Indians from the rest of society and to leave them with a degree of self-government within their own institutions, and the other calculated to bring Indians within the mainstream of American life by terminating special Federal trust relationships and Federal programs and services. Termination reached its aegis during the Eisenhower Administration of the 1950's. The current Administration has taken a strong stand against termination; in his message on Indian affairs, July 13, 1970, President Nixon said:

Because termination is morally and legally unacceptable, because it produces bad practical results and because the mere threat of termination tends to discourage greater self-sufficiency among Indian groups, I am asking the Congress to pass a new concurrent resolution which would expressly renounce, repudiate and repeal the termination policy as expressed by the House Concurrent Resolution 108 of the 83rd Congress. This resolution would explicitly affirm the integrity and rights to continued existence of all Indian tribes and Alaskan Native governments, recognizing that cultural pluralism is a source of national strength. It would assure these groups that the United States Government would continue to carry out its treaty and trusteeship obligations to them as long as the groups themselves believed that such a policy was necessary or desirable. (It would) affirm for the Executive Branch...that the historic relationship between the Federal Government and the Indian communities cannot be abridged without the consent of the Indians.

Sources of Federal Power

The historic relationship to which the President refers has a somewhat confusing background. The Federal Government has exercised plenary power over Indians for almost 200 years. This power emanates from three sources. First, the Constitution grants to the President[3] and to Congress[4] what have been construed as broad powers of authority over Indian affairs. Second, the Federal courts have applied a theory of guardianship and wardship to the Federal Government's jurisdiction over Indian affairs.[5] And, finally, Federal authority is inherent in the Federal Government's ownership of the land which Indian tribes occupy.[6] In Worcester v. Georgia, Chief Justice John Marshall recognized that the afforementioned powers plus the power of war and peace "comprehend all that is required for the regulation of our intercourse with the Indians."[7]

The treaty power was the traditional means for dealing with Indian tribes from the colonial times until 1871, when recognition of Indian tribes as sovereign nations for this purpose was withdrawn by the Indian Appropriation Act, which provided that "...hereafter, no Indian nation or tribe within the territory of the United States shall be acknowledged or recognized as an independent nation, tribe or power with whom the United States may contract by treaty. . . ."[8] Treaties made before 1871 were not nulified by that Act, but remain in force until superceded by Congress. It is a well established principle of constitutional law that treaties have no greater legal force or effect than legislative acts of Congress, and may be unilaterally abrogated, or superceded by subsequent Congressional legislation.[9] Until so abrogated, however, treaties with Indian tribes are part of the law of the land and are binding on the Federal Government. In carrying out its treaty obligations the Federal Government occupies a trust relationship which, according to the Court in Seminole Nation v. United States, "should be judged by the most exacting fiduciary standards."[10] As part of the law of the land treaties cannot be annulled in their effect or operation by the acts of State governments.[11]

Tribal Sovereignty

In considering the constitutional status of American Indians a distinction must be made between tribal entities and individual citizens. As stated before, the legal status of Indian tribes has vacillated throughout this Nation's history in the eyes of the Federal Government. The numerous treaties made with Indian tribes recognized them as governments capable of maintaining diplomatic relations of peace and war and of being responsible, in a political sense, for their violation. When engaged in war against whites, Indians were never treated as rebels, subject to the law of treason, but, "on the contrary, were always regarded and treated as separate and independent nations, entitled to the rights of ordinary belligerents and subject to no other penalties.[12] Hostile Indians surrendering to armed forces were subject to the disabilities and entitled to the rights of prisoners of war.[13]

Tribal sovereignty was originally formally recognized by Chief Justice Marshall in Worcester v. Georgia: "The Constitution, by declaring treaties already made, as well as those to be made, to be the supreme law of the land, has adopted and sanctioned the previous treaties with the Indian nations, and consequently, admits their rank among those powers who are capable of making treaties."[14] That position, which determined the Federal Judiciary's basic policy toward Indian tribes throughout the 19th century may be contrasted with the attitude of later court decisions such as Montoya v. United States,[15] wherein the court concluded that "the word 'nation' as applied to the uncivilized Indians was little more than a compliment."

Today, the concept of tribal sovereignty is widely misunderstood and can only be meaningfully discussed with regard to specific attributes or powers.

Clearly, tribal governments are not on the same legal footing as independent nations; on the other hand, they are widely recognized as political units with governmental powers which exist, in some sense, on a higher level than that of the States. The contemporary meaning of tribal sovereignty is defined in Iron Crow v. Oglala Sioux Tribe of Pine Ridge Reservation[16] as follows:

> It would seem clear that the Constitution, as construed by the Supreme Court, acknowledges the paramount authority of the United States with regard to Indian tribes but recognizes the existence of Indian tribes as quasi-sovereign entities possessing all the inherent rights of sovereignty except where restrictions have been placed thereon by the United States, itself.

In his 1940 edition of Federal Indian law, Felix Cohen summarized the meaning of tribal sovereignty in the following manner:

> The whole course of judicial decision on the nature of Indian tribal powers is marked by adherence to three fundamental principles:
>
> (1) The Indian tribe possesses, in the first instance, all the powers of any sovereign state.
>
> (2) Conquest renders the tribe subject to the legislative power of the United States, and, in substance, terminates the external powers of sovereignty of the tribe, e.g., its power to enter into treaties with foreign nations, but does not, by itself, affect the internal sovereignty of the tribe, i.e., its power of local self-government.
>
> (3) These powers are subject to qualification by treaties and by express legislation by Congress, but, save as thus expressly qualified, full powers of internal sovereignty are vested in the Indian tribes and in their duly constituted organs of government.[17]

Powers of Tribal Self-Government

Indian tribes are recognized in Federal law as distinct political communities with basic domestic and municipal functions. This includes the power to adopt and operate under a form of government of the tribe's choosing, to define conditions of tribal membership, to regulate domestic relations of members, to prescribe rules of inheritence, to levy taxes, to regulate property within the jurisdiction of the tribe, to control the conduct of members by tribal legislation, to administer justice and provide for the punishment of offenses committed on the reservation.[18] Although Indian tribes began their relationship with the Federal Government as sovereign governments recognized as such by treaties and in legislation, the powers of tribal sovereignty have been limited from time to time by the Federal Government. It should be noted, however, that the powers which tribes currently exercise are not delegated powers granted by Congress but rather, are "inherent powers of a limited dependent sovereignty which had not been extinguished by Federal action. What is not expressly limited often remains within the domain of tribal sovereignty simply because State jurisdiction is Federally excluded and governmental authority must be found somewhere. That is a principal to be applied generally in order that there shall be no general failure of governmental control."[19]

The powers of self-government are normally exercised pursuant to tribal constitutions and law and order codes. Normally, these powers include the right of a tribe to define the authority and the duties of its officials, the manner of their appointment or election, the manner of their removal, and the rules they are to observe.[20] This right, as with the exercise of all functions of tribal sovereignty, is subject to Congressional change. For example, Federal law has removed from some tribes the power to choose their own officials and has placed the power of appointment in the President and the Secretary of the Interior.[21]

Indian tribes, having the power to make laws and regulations essential to the administration of justice and the protection of persons and property also have the power to maintain law enforcement departments and courts to enforce them.[22] Some smaller tribes have no courts at all or maintain very traditional customary courts which lack formal structure. Larger tribes, such as the Navajo, maintain quite advanced law and order systems with well-equipped police departments, modern tribal codes and a hierarchy of trial and appellate courts overseen by a tribal supreme court. Generally, the jurisdiction of Indian courts is exclusive as to matters involving tribal affairs,[23] civil suits brought by Indians or non-Indians against tribal members arising out of matters occurring on the reservation,[24] and the prosecution of violations of the tribal criminal code.[25] Tribal jurisdiction operates to the exclusion of Federal and State authority. Federal courts are without jurisdiction over matters involving violations of tribal ordinances,[26] as are State courts.[27] With regard to cases within their jurisdiction, tribal courts are courts of last resort. Their decisions are appealable to neither State or Federal courts.

Several important limitations have been

placed by Congress on tribal jurisdiction. Under the 1968 Indian Civil Rights Act[28] tribes may not exercise jurisdiction over criminal offenses punishable by more than a $500 fine or 6 months in jail. Federal courts have jurisdiction to try and punish certain major offenses such as murder, manslaughter, rape, etc., pursuant to the Major Crimes Act.[29] In certain instances, Congress has provided that the criminal laws and/or civil laws of a State shall extend to Indian reservations located in the State.[30] States which have assumed responsibility for the administration of justice on Indian land are commonly referred to as "Public Law 280 States."

Hunting & Fishing Rights

A current major issue arising from the limitations on State authority due to quasi-tribal sovereignty is the hunting and fishing rights controversy in the Northwest. It is well settled that a State cannot enforce its game and fish laws within the boundaries of an Indian reservation.[31] However, the issue of State control over on-reservation hunting and fishing should be distinguished from the question of the extent to which treaty rights prohibit States from interfering with hunting and fishing by Indians off reservations. In a confusing decision the United States Supreme Court recently held that treaty rights to "fish at all usual and accustomed places" may not be qualified by a State but that the exercise of such rights is subject to reasonable State conservation legislation.[32]

Domestic Relations

Indian tribes exercise a wide latitude of power over the domestic relations of tribal members. Tribes normally conduct marriages and grant divorces[33] to the exclusion of State law even though the Indians concerned are also citizens of the State. Indian customary marriage and divorce has generally been recognized by State and Federal courts.[34]

Tribes also have complete and exclusive authority to define and punish offenses against the marriage relationship, although, as with other civil matters, Congress may make State law applicable.

Taxation

An important power essential to the maintenance of governmental functions is the power of taxation. In Buster v. Wright,[35] it was held that the Creek Nation had the power to impose a license fee upon all persons, Indian and non-Indian, who traded within the borders of that Nation. Tribal authority to levy a property tax on all property within the reservation was upheld in Morris v. Hitchcock.[36] Indian tribes are currently recognized by the United States as "units of local government" for the purpose of receiving Federal revenue funds pursuant to the Revenue Sharing Act of 1972.

As a general matter, then, Indian tribes are recognized by Federal law as governmental units exercising a wide variety of governmental functions, limited only by the assertion of Congressional plenary power over Indian affairs. Outside of the scope of this memorandum is a discussion of the wide spectrum of Federal administrative powers currently exercised over Indian affairs.

Legal Status of Indian Individuals

By virtue of the Indian Citizenship Act of June 2, 1924, all Indians born in the United States are citizens of the United States. As such, they are also citizens of the State in which they live, even though they may reside on a reservation.[37] Although many Indians acquired citizenship prior to 1924, pursuant to various Federal statutes, it was early held that the provision of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution conferring citizenship on "all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof" did not confer citizenship on Indians.[38] State and Federal citizenship and tribal membership are not incompatable;[39] Indians are citizens of three separate political entities. As citizens of the Federal Government they are subject to the laws of the Federal Government no matter where they may be located. As citizens of the tribal government they are subject to the civil and criminal laws of the tribe when they are on the reservation and within its jurisdiction (except, as stated above, in Public Law 280 States). They are subject to the laws of the States while off the reservation.

Protection in the Tribal Setting-Constitutional Immunity

In their relationship with the tribe, Indians are normally protected by a wide variety of criminal due process, civil rights and civil liberties protections contained in the tribal constitution and the tribal law and order code. By their own weight the Bill of Rights and the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution do not impose limitations on tribal action and thus, do not confer protections on tribal members. In the case of Talton v. Mayes[40] for example, the Supreme Court refused to apply the Fifth Amendment to invalidate a tribal law that established a five-man grand jury. In Glover v. United States,[41] the court stated that "the right to be represented by counsel is protected by the Sixth and 14th Amendments. These Améndments, however protect...this right only as against action by the United States in the case of the...Sixth Amendment...and as against action by the States in the case of the 14th Amendment."

Again, in the case of *Native American Church v. Navajo Tribal Council*[42] it was held by implication that a tribal Indian cannot claim protection against illegal search and seizure by tribal officials. In 1954, an attempt to redress tribal invasions of religious freedom arose in a suit against the Jemez Pueblo Tribal Council and governor by Pueblo members, charging that they had been subjected to indignities, threats and reprisals solely because of their Protestant faith and that the tribal council had refused to permit them to bury their dead in the community cemetary and to build a church on tribal land.[43] The court acknowledged that the alleged acts represented a serious invasion of religious freedom but concluded that the acts were *not* taken "under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage of any State or Territory" and thus no cause of action arose either under the Federal Constitution or under Federal civil rights acts. In *State v. Big Sheep*,[44] the Tenth Circuit refused to concede the application of First Amendment protections through the Fourteenth Amendment to Indian tribes:

> No provision in the Constitution makes the First Amendment applicable to Indian nations nor is there any law of Congress doing so. It follows that neither, under the Constitution or the laws of Congress, do the Federal courts have jurisdiction of tribal laws or regulations, even though they may have an impact to some extent on forms of religious workship.[45]

1968 Indian Bill of Rights

These cases illustrate what the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary saw as a "continued denial of Constitutional guarantees" to American Indians, on the ground that tribes are quasi-sovereign entities to which general provisions of the Constitution do not apply. In 1961 that Subcommittee instituted a lengthy investigation of the legal status of American Indians and the problems they encounter when asserting their Constitutional rights in their relations with the State, Federal and tribal governments. This effort, largely engineered by Senator Sam Ervin, Chairman of the Subcommittee, culminated in the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1968,[46] Title II of which constitutes a bill of rights for American Indians. It provides that Indian tribes exercising powers of self-government shall be subject to many of the same limitations and restraints which are imposed on Federal, State and local governments by the United States Constitution. Two major exceptions are that the Indian Bill of Rights provides the right to counsel before tribal courts only at the defendant's "own expense" and, although, religious freedom is protected, the Act does not contain a prohibition against the establishment of religion by a tribal government.

Rights & Privileges of State Citizenship

While off their reservations, Indians are subject to the same laws, both Federal and State, as are other citizens. When brought before State or Federal courts they are entitled to the same Constitutional protections as other defendants. As a general matter, Indians are also entitled to the same Federal and State benefits, programs and services as other State and Federal citizens. From time to time, however, States have attempted to deny Indians participation in State programs on the grounds that their entitlement to special Federal programs made them ineligible. A law of the State of California for example, declared that a local public school board could exclude Indian children from attending if the United States Government maintained a school for Indians within the school district. The California Supreme Court held that the law violated the State and Federal constitutions.[47]

One justification commonly used by States for excluding Indians from participation in State programs and State services has been that Indians do not pay taxes. The restricted status of Indian land renders it immune from State and local taxation and, with certain statutory exceptions, income derived from the land is likewise nontaxable. Other local, State and Federal taxes commonly paid by citizens, including sales taxes, are paid by Indians. Indians pay State taxes on all nontrust property and are obligated for all fees and taxes for the enjoyment of State privileges, such as driving on State highways, and all other taxes which reach the entire population.[48]

All attempts to treat Indian citizens differently or to exclude them from State and local programs raise clear Constitutional questions. As the Chief Counsel of the Bureau of Indian Affairs stated in a memorandum dated July 8, 1953, concerning the refusal of the State of North Dakota to admit and care for feebleminded Indian children in State schools under the same rules and conditions applicable to the admission and care of non-Indians, "such refusal (by the State) to treat Indians in the same manner as non-Indians would appear to deprive the Indians of equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution."

Wardship

There has been some confusion regarding the status of American Indians because of the common notion that Indians are "wards" of the Federal Government. The Federal Government is a trustee of Indian property, not the guardian of individual Indians. In this sense, the term "ward" is inaccurate. Indians are subject to a wide variety of Federal limitations on the distribution of property and assets and income derived from property in Federal trust. Land held in trust for an Indian tribe or for an Indian individual may not be sold without prior approval of the Secretary of the Interior or his representative (the Bureau of Indian Affairs). Related restrictions limit the capacity of an Indian to contract with a private attorney and limit the heirship distribution of trust property. Many Americans erroneously believe that as wards of the Federal Government Indians must stay on reservations[49] and that they receive gratutious payments from the Federal Government. Indians do not in fact receive payments merely because they are Indians. "Payments may be made to Indian tribes or individuals for loses which resulted from treaty violations... individuals may also receive government checks for income from their land and resources, but only because the assets are held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior and payment for the use of the Indian resources has been collected by the Federal Government."[50] Like other citizens, Indians may hold Federal, State and local office, are subject to the draft, may sue and be sued in State courts,[51] may enter into contracts, may own property and dispose of property (other than that held in trust) and, as stated before, pay taxes. The large number of Federal and State laws and provisions which in the past denied Indians political rights and public benefits have either been legislatively repealed, ruled invalid by the Judicial branch or remain unenforced.

AMERICAN INDIANS AND THEIR FEDERAL RELATIONSHIP

Plus a partial listing of other U.S. Indian Groups

This booklet lists all American Indian tribes, Eskimo, and Aleut groups, for which the Bureau of Indian Affairs has definite responsibility. It also includes those tribes, bands, and groups that have been terminated from Bureau of Indian Affairs services in recent years, and those recognized only for purposes of settling claims against the U.S. Government, such as those involving inadequate compensation for land taken in the past. In addition, Indian groups in certain other categories are also listed.

The basic listing is by State. Following the name of the State, which is given in Alphabetical order, is the Bureau of Indian Affairs office that has immediate jurisdiction over Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut groups with its address. The tribes under it follow.

Next are tribes that do not receive Bureau of Indian Affairs services.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs Area Office is the highest ranking field office in the Bureau structure. Next in Order is generally the Bureau of Indian Affairs Agency that reports to it. It is usually located on the reservation it serves.

In the case of Agencies and other Bureau offices of somewhat similar rank, the Area Office to which they report is indicated, to the right, in parentheses. The addresses of all of the Area Offices in the Bureau are listed at the back of the booklet.

Throughout the booklet a code number follows the name of each Indian group. It indicates the status of each as of June 1972. However, changes may occur at any time. Here is what each number means:

1. Indian or Alaska Native organizations whose constitutions are approved by the Secretary of the Interior under Federal statutory authority of the Indian Reorganization Act; Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act; or Alaska Native Act.
2. Indian or Alaska Native organizations whose constitutions are approved by the Secretary of the Interior or his designated representative under authority other than the Indian Reorganization Act; Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act; or Alaska Native Act.
3. Indian organizations without written governing documents that are served by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.
4. Public Domain allotments. Indian individuals who reside on these lands receive Bureau of Indian Affairs services on the basis of the Secretary of the Interior's responsibility over the land.
5. Indian groups that receive assistance from the Bureau only in matters relating to the settlement of claims against the U.S. Government, such as those involving inadequate compensation for land taken in the past.
6. Indian groups no longer entitled to Bureau of Indian Affairs services because of specific statutes. (Terminated groups.)
7. Others. Groups that have never received Bureau of Indian Affairs services.
8. Indian groups that do not fit into any of the above classifications.

Map code numbers preceding the names of some of the groups listed in this booklet may be used in conjunction with a map which shows the location of the Indian groups. Such map entitled "Indian Lands and Related Facilities, 1971, General," is available from the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C. 20242, price 35 cents.

Map code numbers are assigned to State reservations (Number 1-26), Indian groups without trust land (Number 30-67) and terminated tribes and groups (Number 80-90).

No code location numbers have been assigned to groups on Federal trust lands since these are generally recognizable by inspection of the map itself.

Alabama

(30) Creek Indian Community--near Atmore (7) no corporate land base

Creeks East of the Mississippi (5)

Alaska

Asterisk indicates that the Indian group is also incorporated under State law.

Area Director
Juneau Area Office
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Box 3-8000
Juneau, Alaska 99801

The following groups, formerly served by the Southeast Agency, are now directly under Area Office jurisdiction).

Angoon (1)*
Craig (1)*
Douglas (1)*
Haines (Port Chilkoot) (1)*
Hoonah (1)*
Hydaburg (1)*
Kake (1)*
Kasaan (1)
Ketchikan (1)
Klawock (1)*
Cluckwan (Chilkat) (1)
Metlakatla (1)
Petersburg (1)*
Saxman (1)*
Sitka (1)*
Wrangell (1)*
Pelican City (3)*
Skagway (3)*
Tenakee Springs (3)
Yakutat (3)*

Superintendent
Anchorage Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
16th and C Sts., Box 120
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
(Juneau Area Office)

Atka (1)
Chanega (1) (destroyed by earthquake)
Kantak (1)
Karluk (1)*
Kenaitze (1)
Nikolski (1)
Perryville (1)
St. Paul (1)*
Tatitlek (1).
Tyonek (1)

Akhiok (Alitak) (3)
Akutan (3)
Aleknagik (3)
Belkofsky (3)
Bristol Bay (3)*
Chignik (3)
Chignik Lagoon (3)
Chignik Lake (3)
Chistochina (3)
Clark's Point (3)
Copper Center (3)
Cordova (3)*
Dillingham (3)*
Egegik (3)
Eklutna (3)
Ekuk (3)
Ekwok (3)
English Bay (3)
False Pass (3)
Gulkana (3)
Iliamna (3)
Ivanof Bay (3)
King Cove (3)*
Koliganek (3)
Kokhanok (3)
Larsen Bay (3)
Levelock (3)
Matanuska (3)*
Manokotak (3)*
Mentasta Lake (3)
Naknek (3)*
Nelson Lagoon (3)
Newhalen (3)
New Stuyahok (3)
Ninilchik (3)
Nondalton (3)
Old Harbor (3)*
Ouzinkie (3)
Palmer (3)
Paulof Harbor (3)
Pedro Bay (3)
Pilot Point (3)
Portage Creek (3)
Port Graham (3)
Port Heiden (3)
Port Lions (3)*.
St. George Island (3)
Sand Point (3)*
South Naknek (3)*
Sterling (3)
Togiak (3)*
Twin Hills (3)
Ugashik (3)
Unalaska (3)*
Valdez (3)*

Superintendent
Bethel Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
P.O. Box 347
Bethel, Alaska 99559
(Juneau Area Office)

Akiachak (1)
Akiak (1)
Grayling (Holikachuk) (1)
Kwethluk (1)
Kwigillingok (1)
Mekoryuk (1)
Napakiak (1)*
Nunapitchuk (1)
Quinhagak (Kwinhagak) (1)
Shageluk (1)
Tuluksak (1)*
Tununak (1)

Alakanuk (3)
Aniak (3)
Anvik (3)
Atmautluak (3)
Bethel (3)
Chaloonawick (3)
Chaneliak (3)
Chefornak (3)
Chevak (3)*
Churarbalik--see Russian Mission (Kuskokwim)
Crooked Creek (3)
Eek (3)
Emmonak (Kwiguk) (3)*
Farewell (3)
Flat (3)
Georgetown (3)
Goodnews Bay (Mumtrak) (3)
Hamilton (3)
Holy Cross (3)
Hooper Bay (3)*
Kalskag (3)
Kasigluk (3)
Kipnuk (3)
Kongigonak (3)
Kotlik (3)*
Kwinhagak--See Quinhagak
Lelida (3)
Lime Village (3)
Lower Kalskag (3)
Marshall (3)
Medfra (3)
McGrath (3)
Mountain Village (3)
Nepaimute (Napamute) (3)
Napaskiak (3)
Newtok (3)
Nightmute (3)
Nikolai (3)
Oscarville (3)
Pilot Station (3)
Pitkas Point (3)
Platinum (3)
Quinhagak (3) (also spelled Kwinhagak)
Red Devil (3)
Russian Mission (Kuskokwim) (3) (Native name is Churarbalik)
Russian Mission (Yukon) (3)
St. Mary's (3)*
Scammon Bay (3)*
Sheldon's Point (3)
Sleetmute (3)
Stony River (3)
Takotna (3)
Toksook Bay (3)
Tuntutuliak (3)

Superintendent
Fairbanks Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
P.O. Box 350
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701
(Juneau Area Office)

Fort Yukon (1)&
Inupiat (1)
Minto (1)
Point Lay (1)
Stevens Village (1)
Tanacross (1)
Tanana (1)&
Tetlin (1)
Venetie (1)

Allakaket (3)
Anaktuvuk Pass (3)*
Arctic Village (3)
Barrow (3)*
Barter Island (3)
Beaver (3)
Bettles (3)
Birch Creek (3)
Cantwell (3)
Canyon Village (3)
Chalkyitsik (3)
Circle (3)
Delta Junction (3)*
Dot Lake (3)
Eagle (3)*
Galena (3)
Hughes (3)
Huslia (3)
Kaltag (3)
Koyukuk (3)
Manley Hot Springs (3)
Nenana (3)*
Northway (3)
Nulato (3)*
Rampart (3)
Ruby (3)
Tok (3)
Wainwright (3)*

Superintendent
Nome Agency
P.O. Box 190
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Nome, Alaska 99762
(Juneau Area Office)

Buckland (1)*
Deering (1)*
Elim (1)*
Gambell (1)*
King Island (1)*
Kivalina (1)*
Kotzebue (1)*
Koyuk (1)*
Little Diomede (1)*
Noatak (1)*
Nome (1)*
Noorvik (1)*
Point Hope (1)*
St. Michael (1)*
Savoonga (1)*
Selawik (1)*
Shaktoolik (1)*
Shishmaref (1)*
Shungnak (1)*
Stebbins (1)*
Unalakleet (1)*
Wales (1)*
White Mountain (1)*

Ambler (3)*
Brevig Mission (3)*
Candle (3)
Golovin (3)*
Kiana (3)*
Kobuk (3)*
Northeast Cape (3)*
Teller (3)*

Director
Southeast Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
P.O. Box 1587
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Tlingit and Haida (2) Under a contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the functions of the Southeast Agency as they relate to Tlingit and Haida are now performed by the Tlingit and Haida Central Council.

Arizona

Superintendent
Chinle Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Chinle, Arizona 86503
(Navajo Area Office)

Navajo Nation (2) (in Arizona, New Mexico and Utah)

(Districts and Chapters)

Dist. 4
Blue Gap
Forest Lake
Hard Rock
Pinon

Dist. 10
Chinle
Many Farms
Nazlini
Rough Rock
Tselani

Dist. 11
Lukachukai
Round Rock
Tsailee-Wheatfields
(Arizona and New Mexico)

Superintendent
Colorado River Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Parker, Arizona 85344
(Phoenix Area Office)

Chemehuevi Indian Tribe (1) (in California)
Colorado River Indian Tribes (1) (in Arizona and California)
Fort Mojave Tribe (1) (in Arizona, California, and Nevada)

Subagency Superintendent
Fort Yuma Subagency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Yuma, Arizona 85364
(Colorado River Agency,
Phoenix Area Office)

Cocopah Tribe (1)
Quechan Indian Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation (1) (in California and Arizona)

Superintendent
FortApache Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Whiteriver, Arizona
85941
(Phoenix Area Office)

White Mountain Apache Tribe (1)

Superintendent
Fort Defiance Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Fort Defiance, Arizona
86504
(Navajo Area Office)

Navajo Nation (2) (in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah)

(Districts and Chapters)

Dist. 7
Dilkon
Indian Wells
Jeddito
Low Mountain
Teesto
White Cone

Dist. 14
Coyote Canyon
Mexican Springs
Naschitti
Tohatchi
Twin Lakes

Dist. 17
Cornfields
Ganado
Greasewood
Kinlichee
Klagetoh
Steamboat
Wide Ruins

Dist. 18
Crystal (Arizona and New Mexico)
Fort Defiance (Arizona and New Mexico)
Houck
Lupton
Oak Springs
Red Lake (Arizona and New Mexico)
St. Michaels
Sawmill

Superintendent
Hopi Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Keams Canyon, Arizona
86034
(Phoenix Area Office)

Hopi Tribe (1)
Kaibab Bank of Paiute Indians (1)

Superintendent
Papago Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Sells, Arizona 85634
(Phoenix Area Office)

Papago Tribe (Sells, Gila Bend, and San Xavier Reservations) (1)

Superintendent
Pima Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Sacaton, Arizona 85247
(Phoenix Area Office)

Ak-Chin Indian Community (1)
Gila River Indian Community (1)

Coordinator
Salt River Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Route 1, Box 907
Scottsdale, Arizona
85251
(Phoenix Area Office)

Fort McDowell Mohave-Apache Community (1)
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (1)

Superintendent
San Carlos Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
San Carlos, Arizona
85550
(Phoenix Area Office)

San Carlos Apache Tribe (1)

Superintendent
Shiprock Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Shiprock, New Mexico
87420
(Navajo Area Office)

Navajo Nation (2) (in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah)

(Districts and Chapters)

Dist. 9
Mexican Water (in Utah and Arizona)
Red Mesa (in Utah and Arizona)
Teecnospos (in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah)

Dist. 12
Beclabito (in Arizona and New Mexico)
Red Rock (in Arizona and New Mexico)
Sanostee (in Arizona and New Mexico)

Superintendent
Truxton Canyon Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Valentine, Arizona 86437
(Phoenix Area Office)

Havasupai Tribe (1)
Hualapai Tribe (1)
Yavapai-Apache Indian Community (Camp Verde) (1)
Yavapai-Prescott Community Association (2)

Superintendent
Tuba City Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Tuba City, Arizona 86045
(Navajo Area Office)

Navajo Nation (2) (in Arizona, New Mexico and Utah)

(Districts and Chapters)

Dist. 1
Copper Mine
Kaibeto
Lechee
Red Lake
Dist 2
Inscription House
Navajo Mountain (in Utah and Arizona)
Shonto (in Utah and Arizona)
Dist. 3
Broadway
Cameron
Coalmine
Tuba City
Dist. 5
Bird Springs
Leupp
Tolani Lake
Dist. 8
Chilchinbeto (in Utah and Arizona)
Dennehotso (in Utah and Arizona)
Kayenta (in Utah and Arizona)
Olijatoh (in Utah and Arizona)

Other Groups in Arizona

(31) Yaqui Indians of Arizona (8)
  P.L. 88-350 (Act of Oct. 8, 1964)
    Pascua Village (Tucson) Special Federal involvement in terms of establishing a new village
    Barrio Libre (South Tucson)
(32) Guadalupe (Phoenix) (7)
(32A) Tonto Apache, Payson (7)

California

Superintendent
Central California Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Federal Building
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, California 95825
(Sacramento Area Office)

Cachil Dehe Bank of Wintun Indians of the Colusa Indian Community (1)
Covelo Indian Community (Round Valley Reservation) (1)
Fort Bidwell Indian Community (1)
Grindstone Indian Rancheria (1)
Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of the Stewarts Point Rancheria (1)
Manchester Band of Pomo Indians (1)
Santa Rosa Indian Community (Kings County) (1)
Susanville Indian Rancheria (1)
Tule River Indian Tribe (1)
Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians (1)
Alturas Rancheria (2)
Cahto Indian Tribe of Laytonville Rancheria (2)
Fort Independence Indian Community (2)
Pit River Home and Agricultural Cooperative Assn. (X-L Ranch) (2)
Berry Creek Rancheria (3)
Big Pine Band of Owens Valley Paiute-Shoshone Indians (Owens Valley) (3)
Cedarville Rancheria (3)
Cortina Rancheria (3)
Dry Creek Rancheria (3)
El-Em Indian Colony (Sulphur Bank) (3)
Enterprise Rancheria (3)
Paiute-Shoshone Indians of the Bishop Community (Owens Valley) (3)
Paiute-Shoshone Indians of the Lone Pine Community (Owens Valley) (3)
Lookout Rancheria (3)
Sheep Ranch Rancheria (3)
Shingle Springs Rancheria (Verona Tract) (3) (unoccupied)
Yokayo (9) near Ukiah

Termination Pending

Upper Lake Band of Pomo Indians (3)
Big Sandy Association (3)

Hopland Nokomis Association (3)
Jackson Rancheria (3)
Likely Rancheria (no membership) (1.32 acres of cemetery remaining)
Middletown Rancheria (3) (Named in original Rancheria Act PL 85-671 but has made no progress toward termination.)
Rumsey Rancheria (3)
Sherwood Valley Rancheria (3)
Sycamore Valley Association (Cold Springs) (3)
Table Mountain Rancheria (3)

Terminated Since 1958
(Category 6) (72 Stat. 619 and 78 Stat. 390)
Alexander Valley. Termination effective 8-1-61
Auburn. Termination effective 8-18-67
Big Valley. Termination effective 11-11-65
Buena Vista. Termination effective 4-11-61
Cache Creek. Termination effective 4-11-61
Chicken Ranch. Termination effective 8-1-61
Chico. Termination effective 6-2-67
Cloverdale. Termination effective 12-30-65
Graton. Termination effective 2-18-66
Greenville. Termination effective 12-8-66
Guidiville. Termination effective 9-3-65
Indian Ranch. Termination effective 9-22-64
Lytton. Termination effective 8-1-61
Mark West. Termination effective 4-11-61
Mooretown. Termination effective 8-1-61
Nevada City. Termination effective 9-22-64
North Fork. Termination effective 2-18-66
Paskenta. Termination effective 4-11-61
Picayune. Termination effective 2-18-66
Pinoleville. Termination effective 2-18-66
Potter Valley. Termination effective 8-1-61
Quartz Valley. Termination effective 1-20-67
Redwood Valley. Termination effective 8-1-61
Robinson. Termination effective 9-3-65
Ru-fey's. Termination effective 4-11-61
Scotts Valley. Termination effective 9-3-65
Shingle Springs. (El Dorado tract) Termination effective 7-16-66
Strathmore. Land Sold, deed approved 9-29-67
Strawberry Valley. Termination effective 4-11-61
Taylorsville. Land Sold, deed approved 11-4-66
Wilton. Termination effective 9-22-64

Superintendent
Hoopa Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Hoopa, California 95546
(Sacramento Area Office)

Hoopa Valley Tribe (2)
Big Bend Rancheria (3)
Hoopa Extension (3)
Montgomery Creek Rancheria (3)
Roaring Creek Rancheria (3)

Termination Pending
Cher-ae Heights Indian Community of the Trinidad Rancheria (2) (Constitution revoked)
Big Lagoon Rancheria (3)
Resighini Rancheria (3) (no residents)

Terminated Since 1958
(Category 6) (72 Stat. 619 and 78 Stat. 390)
Blue Lake. Termination effective 9-15-66
Crescent City (Elk Valley). Termination effective 7-16-66
Redding. Termination effective 6-20-62
Rohnerville. Termination effective 7-16-66
Smith River. Termination effective 7-29-67
Table Bluff. Termination effective 4-11-61

Director
Palm Springs Office
Bureau of Indian Affairs
587 South Palm Canyon Drive
Palm Springs, California 92262
(Sacramento Area Office)

Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians (Palm Springs) (2)

Superintendent
Southern California Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
6848 Magnolia Avenue, Suite 8
Riverside, California 92506
(Sacramento Area Office)

Santa Ynez Band of Mission Indians (1)
San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians (1)
Cabazon Band of Mission Indians (2)
La Jolla Band of Mission Indians (2)
Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians (2)
Pala Band of Mission Indians (2)
Pauma Band of Mission Indians (2)
Rincon, San Luiseno Band of Mission Indians (2)
San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (2)
Twentynine Palms Band of Mission Indians (2)
Augustine Band of Mission Indians (3) (no resident members)
Barona Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians (3)
Cahuilla Band of Mission Indians (3)
Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians (3)
Cauyapaipe Band of Mission Indians (3) (no resident members)
Inaja-Cosmit Reservation (3)
LaPosta Band of Mission Indians (3)
Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians (3)
Manzanita Band of Mission Indians (3)
Mission Band of Indians of Campo Community (3)
Morongo Band of Mission Indians (3)
Pechanga Band of Mission Indians (3)
Ramona Reservation (3) (no members)
Santa Rosa Band of Mission Indians (3)
Santa Ysabel Band of Mission Indians (3)
Soboba Band of Mission Indians (3)
Sycuan Band of Mission Indians (3)
Torres-Martinez Band of Mission Indians (3)
Viejas (Baron Long) Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians (3)

Terminated Since 1958
(72 Stat. 619 and 78 Stat. 390)

Mission Creek Band of Mission Indians (6) Termination effective 7-14-70

Superintendent
Colorado River Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Parker, Arizona 85344
(Phoenix Area Office)

Chemehuevi Indian Tribe (1)
Colorado River Indian Tribes (1) (in Arizona and California)
Fort Mojave Tribe (1) (in Arizona, California, and Nevada)

Superintendent
Fort Yuma Subagency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Yuma, Arizona 85364
(Colorado River Agency, Phoenix Area Office)

Quechan Indian Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation (1) (in California and Arizona)

Superintendent
Nevada Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Stewart, Nevada 89437
(Phoenix Area Office)

Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California (1) (Woodfords Community)

Other Groups in California

(33) Pit River Indians, Alturas (7) (no trust land)
(34) Jamul Diegueno (7) (near San Diego) (no trust land)

Colorado

Superintendent
Southern Ute Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
P.O. Box 315
Ignacio, Colorado 81137
(Albuquerque Area Office)

Southern Ute Tribe (1)

Connecticut

(5) Paugusett (Golden Hill Reservation) (7)

(6) Pequot (Eastern Pequot Reservation) (7)

(7) Pequot (Western Pequot Reservation (Lantern Hill) (7)

(8) Scaticook (Schagticoke Reservation) (Kent) (7)

(35) Mohegan Community (7) New London County (no land base)

Delaware

(36) Moor Community (7) Kent County (no land base)

(37) Nanticoke Community (7) Sussex County (no land base)

Florida

Chairman
Miccosukee Business Committee
P.O. Box 440-21
Tamiami Station
Miami, Florida 33100
(Washington Office, Director of Southeastern Agencies)

(23) Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida (1) (Tribe is performing service formerly provided by Miccosukee Agency, pursuant to a contract effective May 14, 1971.)

Superintendent
Seminole Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
6075 Stirling Road
Hollywood, Florida 33024
(Washington Office, Director of Southeastern Agencies)

(24) Seminole Tribe of Florida (1)

(37-A) Nonenrolled Seminoles in Tamiami Trail Area (7) (eligible for membership with either of the Florida tribes--have no corporate land base).

Idaho

Superintendent
Fort Hall Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Fort Hall, Idaho 83203
(Portland Area Office)

Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation (1)

Northwestern Bank of Shoshone Indians (Washakie) (in Utah) (4)

Superintendent
Northern Idaho Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Lapwai, Idaho 83540
(Portland Area Office)

Kalispel Indian Community (in Washington state) (1)

Coeur d'Alene Tribe (2)

Kootenai Tribe of Idaho (2)

Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho (2)

Officer in Charge
Western Shoshone Subagency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Owyhee, Nevada 89832
(Nevada Agency, Phoenix Area Office)

Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Reservation (1) (in Idaho and Nevada)

Indiana

(38) Miami (7) at Peru, forming a community (no corporate land base) (not to be confused with the several hundred persons in the area who are merely "descendants" for claims purposes.)

Potawatomi Indians of Indiana and Michigan, Inc. (7)

Iowa

Officer in Charge
Sac and Fox Area Field Office
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Tama, Iowa 52339
(Minneapolis Area Office)

Sac and Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa (1)

Superintendent
Winnebago Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Winnebago, Nebraska 68071
(Aberdeen Area Office)

Omaha Tribe of Nebraska (1)
(in Nebraska and Iowa)
Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska
(1) (in Nebraska and Iowa)
(off-reservation lands in
Iowa)

Kansas

Superintendent
Horton Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Horton, Kansas 66439
(Anadarko Area Office)

Iowa Tribe (1) (in Kansas
and Nebraska)
Kickapoo Tribe in Kansas (1)
Sac and Fox Tribe of the
Missouri (1) (in Kansas
and Nebraska)
Prairie Band of Potowatomi
Indians (2)

Other Groups in Kansas

(39) Chippewa and Munsee
Delaware Community (7)
Franklin County
(39-A) Wyandot Community (7)
Wyandot County

Louisiana

Superintendent
Choctaw Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Philadelphia,
Mississippi 39350
(Washington Office,
Director of Southeastern Agencies)

Chitimacha Tribe of Louisiana
(1)

Other Groups in Louisiana

(40) Choctaw Community, La
Salle Parish (7)
(41) Choctaw Community,
Rapides Parish (7)
(42) Choctaw Community, St.
Tammany Parish (7)
(43) Coushatta Community,
Allen and Jefferson Davis
Parishes (5),
(44) Houma Communities,
Terrebonne and Lafourche
Parishes (7) (no corporate
land base)
(45) Tunica Community,
Aroyelles Parish (7) (land
evidently not taxed by
State)

Maine

Association of Aroostook
Indians (7)
(46) Malecite (Maliseet)
scattered families and
groups
(46-A) Micmac. Scattered
families and groups.
(1 and 2) Passamaquoddy
Tribe (8)
(1) Indian Township
Reservation
[illegible] Pleasant Point
Reservation
(3) Penobscot Tribe (8)
(Served by State)

Massachusetts

(4) Nipmuc Tribe (Hassanimisco Band (7)
Grafton Reservation
(colonially derived)
Freetown Forest (no
residents)
(47) Nipmuc Community, near
Worcester (7)
(48) Wampanoag Community,
Mashpee (7)
(49) Wampanoag Tribal Group
(Gay Head Village) (7)
(not taxed by State)

Michigan

Superintendent
Great Lakes Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Ashland, Wisconsin 54806
(Minneapolis Area
Office)

Bay Mills Indian Community
(1)
Hannahville Indian Community
(1)
Keweenaw Bay Indian Community
(L'Anse Reservation) (1)
Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe
(Isabella Reservation) (1)

Other Groups in Michigan

- (50) Ottawa and Chippewa Indians of Michigan (8)
  - Northern Michigan Ottawa Assn. (7)
  - Original Sault Ste. Marie Band of Chippewa Indians, Inc. (7) Sugar Island group of Chippewas and their descendants who are using a portion of the tribal lands held in trust for the Bay Mills Indian Community.
- (51) Pogagon Potawatomi (7) (no corporate land base)
- (8A) Potawatomi of the Huron (7) (Calhoun County)
- Potawatomi Indians of Indiana and Michigan, Inc. (7)

Minnesota

Superintendent
Great Lakes Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Ashland, Wisconsin 54806
(Minneapolis Area Office)

Wisconsin Winnebago Tribe (1) (in the State of Wisconsin and Houston County, Minnesota)

Superintendent
Minnesota Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
P.O. Box 489
Bemidji, Minnesota 56601
(Minneapolis Area Office)

- Minnesota Chippewa Tribe (1) (six component reservations)
  - Boise Forte Band (Nett Lake)
  - Fond du Lac Band
  - Grand Portage Band
  - Leech Lake Band
  - Mille Lac Band
  - White Earth Band
- Lower Sioux Indian Community (Morton) (1)
- Prairie Island Indian Community (1)
- Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community (Prior Lake) (1)
- Upper Sioux Indian Community (Granite Falls) (3)

Superintendent
Red Lake Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Red Lake, Minnesota 56671
(Minneapolis Area Office)

Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians (2)

Mississippi

Superintendent
Choctaw Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Philadelphia, Mississippi 39350
(Washington Office, Director of Southeastern Agencies)

- Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians (1)
- Chitimacha Tribe of Louisiana (in Louisiana) (1)

Montana

Superintendent
Blackfeet Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Browning, Montana 59417
(Billings Area Office)

Blackfeet Tribe (1)

Superintendent
Crow Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Crow Agency, Montana 59022
(Billings Area Office)

Crow Tribe of Indians (2)

Superintendent
Flathead Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Ronan, Montana 59864
(Billings Area Office)

Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation (1)

Superintendent
Fort Belknap Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Harlem, Montana 59526
(Billings Area Office)

Fort Belknap Indian Community (1)
Turtle Mountain Public Domain Allotments (4)

Superintendent
Fort Peck Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
P.O. Box 637
Poplar, Montana 59255
(Billings Area Office)

Assinboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Reservation (2)
Turtle Mountain Public Domain Allotments (4)

Superintendent
Northern Cheyenne Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Lame Deer, Montana 59043
(Billings Area Office)

Northern Cheyenne Tribe (1)

Superintendent
Rocky Boy's Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Box Elder, Montana 59521
(Billings Area Office)

Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation (1)

Other Groups in Montana

(52-A) Landless and non-enrolled Chippewas, Crees and Metis (7)
Great Falls (Hill 57)
Hays
Wolf Point (and other towns and cities in Montana)

Nebraska

Superintendent
Winnebago Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Winnebago, Nebraska
68071
(Aberdeen Area Office)

Omaha Tribe of Nebraska (1) in Nebraska and Iowa)
Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska (1)
Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska (1) (in Nebraska and Iowa) (Off-reservation lands in Iowa)

Superintendent
Pine Ridge Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Pine Ridge, South Dakota
57770
(Aberdeen Area Office)

Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation (1) (only a minor part of reservation in Nebraska)

Superintendent
Horton Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Horton, Kansas 66439
(Anadarko Area Office)

Iowa Tribe (1) (in Kansas and Nebraska)
Sac and Fox Tribe of Missouri (1) (in Kansas and Nebraska)

Other Groups in Nebraska

(80) Ponca Tribe of Nebraska (6) (76 Stat. 937) Termination effective 10-27-66

Nevada

Superintendent
Nevada Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Stewart, Nevada 89437
(Phoenix Area Office)

Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation (1) (in Nevada and Utah)
Duckwater Shoshone Tribe (1)
Ely Indian Colony (1)
Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe (1) (in Nevada and Oregon)
Las Vegas Tribe of Paiute Indians (1)
Lovelock Paiute Tribe (1)
Moapa Band of Paiute Indians (1)
Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of Nevada (1)
Reno-Sparks Indian Colony of Nevada (1)
Summit Lake Paiute Tribe, Nevada (1)

Te-Moak Bands of Western Shoshone Indians (1) (Battle Mountain, Elko and South Fork)

Walker River Paiute Tribe of Nevada (1)

Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California (1) (Carson Colony, Dresslerville Colony and Woodfords Community)

Yerington Paiute Tribe (Campbell Ranch) (1)

Yomba Shoshone Tribe (1)

Paiute-Shoshone Tribe of the Fallon Reservation and Colony (2)

Ruby Valley (3)

Winnemucca Colony (1)

Officer in Charge
Western Shoshone Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Owyhee, Nevada 89832
(Nevada Agency, Phoenix Area Office)

Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Reservation (1) (in Nevada and Idaho)

Superintendent
Colorado River Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Parker, Arizona 85344
(Phoenix Area Office)

Fort Mojave Tribe (1) (in Arizona, California, and Nevada)

New Mexico

Superintendent
Chinle Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Chinle, Arizona 86503
(Navajo Area Office)

Navajo Nation (2) (in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah)

(Districts and Chapters)

Dist. 11

Tsailee-Wheatfields (in Arizona and New Mexico)

Superintendent
Eastern Navajo Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Crownpoint, New Mexico 87313
(Navajo Area Office)

Navajo Nation (2) (in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah)

(Districts and Chapters)

Alamo
Canoncito
(Ramah--under Albuquerque Area Office)

Dist. 15

Becenti
Crownpoint
Dalton Pass
Lake Valley
Little Water
Pueblo Paintado
Standing Rock
Torreon and Star Lake
Whitehorse Lake
White Rock

Dist. 16

Baca
Bread Springs
Casamero Lake
Cheechilgeetho
Church Rock
Iyanbit
Manuelito
Mariano Lake
Pinedale
Red Rock
Rock Springs
Smith Lake
Thoreau
Tsayatoh

Dist. 19

Huerfano
Nageezi
Ojo Encino

Superintendent
Fort Defiance Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Fort Defiance, Arizona 86504

Navajo Nation (2) (in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah)

(Districts and Chapters)

Dist. 18

Crystal (Arizona and New Mexico)
Fort Defiance (Arizona and New Mexico)
Red Lake (Arizona and New Mexico)

Superintendent
Jicarilla Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Dulce, New Mexico 87528
(Albuquerque Area Office)

Jicarilla Apache Tribe (1)

Superintendent
Mescalero Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Mescalero, New Mexico
88340
(Albuquerque Area
Office)

Apache Tribe of the Mescalero
Reservation (1)

Superintendent
Northern Pueblos Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
P.O. Box 580
Santa Fe, New Mexico
87501
(Albuquerque Area
Office)

Santa Clara Pueblo (1)
Nambe Pueblo (3)
Picuris Pueblo (3)
Pojoaque Pueblo (3)
San Ildefonso Pueblo (3)
San Juan Pueblo (3)
Taso Pueblo (3)
Tesuque Pueblo (3)

Superintendent
Ramah-Navajo Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Ramah, New Mexico 87321
(Albuquerque Area
Office)

Navajo Nation (2) (in
Arizona, New Mexico, and
Utah)
Ramah Chapter

Superintendent
Shiprock Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Shiprock, New Mexico
87420
(Navajo Area Office)

Navajo Nation (2) (in
Arizona, New Mexico, and
Utah)

(Districts and Chapters)

Dist. 9
Mexican Water (in Utah and
Arizona)
Red Mesa (in Utah and
Arizona)
Rock Point
Sweetwater
Teecnospos (in New Mexico,
Arizona and Utah)

Dist. 12
Aneth
Beclabito (in Arizona
and New Mexico)
Red Rock (in Arizona and
New Mexico)
Sanostee (in Arizona and
New Mexico)
Sheep Springs
Shiprock
Two Grey Hills

Dist. 13
Burnham
Nenahnezad
Upper Fruitland

Superintendent
Southern Pueblos Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
P.O. Box 1667
Albuquerque, New Mexico
87103
(Albuquerque Area
Office)

Isleta Pueblo (1)
Laguna Pueblo (1)
Acoma Pueblo (3)
Cochiti Pueblo (3)
Jemez Pueblo (3)
San Felipe Pueblo (3)
Sandia Pueblo (3)
Santa Ana Pueblo (3)
Santo Domingo Pueblo (3)
Zia Pueblo (3)

Governor, Zuni Tribal
Council
Zuni Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Zuni, New Mexico 87327
(Albuquerque Area
Office)

Zuni Tribe (1)

Superintendent
Ute Mountain Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Towaoc, Colorado 81334
(Albuquerque Area
Office)

Ute Mountain Ute Tribe (1)
(in Colorado, New Mexico,
and Utah)

New York

Special Liaison
Representative
For "Tribes" of the
Iroquois Confederacy
Bureau of Indian Affairs
P.O. Box 268-A
Irving, New York 14081
(Washington Office,
New York Coordinator)

(13) Cayuga Nation (3) (No reservation of its own--members live on Cattaraugus Reservation owned by the Seneca Nation).
(9) Oneida Nation of New York (3)
(10) Onondaga Nation (3)
(11) St. Regis Band of Mohawks (Akwesasne) (3)
(15) Tonawanda Band of Seneca Indians (3)
(16) Tuscarora Nation (3)

Special Liaison Representative
For the Seneca Nation
Bureau of Indian Affairs
P.O. Box 500
Salamanca, New York
14779
(Washington Office, New York Coordinator)

Seneca Nation (3)
- (12) Allegany Reservation
- (13) Cattaraugus Reservation
- (14) Oil Springs Reservation

Other Groups in New York

(54) Montauk Community (7) (Long Island) (no corporate land base)
(17) Poosepatuck (7) (State reservation) (Long Island)
(18) Shinnecock (7) (State reservation) (Long Island)

North Carolina

Superintendent
Cherokee Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Cherokee, North Carolina
28719
(Washington Office, Director of Southeastern Agencies)

Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians (3)

Other Groups in North Carolina

(55) Coharie Indians (7) Sampson and adjoining counties
(56) Indians of Person County (7)
(57) Haliwa Indians (7) (Halifax and Warren Counties)
(58) Lumbee Indians of North Carolina (7) (Robeson and adjoining counties) (70 Stat. 254)
(59) Waccamaw Communities (7) Columbus and Brunswick Counties

North Dakota

Superintendent
Fort Berthold Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
New Town, North Dakota
58763
(Aberdeen Area Office)

Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation (1)

Superintendent
Fort Totten Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Fort Totten, North Dakota 58335
(Aberdeen Area Office)

Devils Lake Sioux Tribe (2)

Superintendent
Sisseton Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Sisseton, South Dakota
57252
(Aberdeen Area Office)

Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe (2) (in North and South Dakota) (only a minor portion in North Dakota)

Superintendent
Standing Rock Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Fort Yates, North Dakota
58538
(Aberdeen Area Office)

Standing Rock Sioux Tribe (2) (in North and South Dakota)

Superintendent
Turtle Mountain Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Belcourt, North Dakota
58316
(Aberdeen Area Office)

Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians (2) (some allotments in Montana)

Oklahoma

Superintendent
Anadarko Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Anadarko, Oklahoma 73005
(Anadarko Area Office)

Apache (Kiowa-Apache) (2)
Caddo Indian Tribe of Oklahoma (1)
Comanche Indian Tribe (2)
Delaware Tribe of Indians of Western Oklahoma (2)
Fort Sill Apache Tribe (3)
Kiowa (2)
Wichita Indian Tribe of Oklahoma (2)

Superintendent
Ardmore Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
P.O. Box 997
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401
(Muskogee Area Office)

Chickasaw Nation of Oklahoma (3)

Superintendent
Concho Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Concho, Oklahoma 73022
(Anadarko Area Office)

Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma (1)

Superintendent
Okmulgee Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
P.O. Box 671
Okmulgee, Oklahoma 74447
(Muskogee Area Office)

Alabama-Quassarte Tribal Town (1)
Kialegee Tribal Town (1)
Thlopthlocco Tribal Town (1)
Creek Nation of Oklahoma (3)

Superintendent
Osage Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Pawhuska, Oklahoma 74056
(Muskogee Area Office)

Osage Tribe of Indians (2)

Superintendent
Pawnee Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Pawnee, Oklahoma 74058
(Andarko Area Office)

Kaw Indian Tribe of Oklahoma (2)
Pawnee Indian Tribe of Oklahoma (1)
Ponca Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma (1)
Tonkawa Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma (1)
Otoe-Missouria Tribe (3)

Superintendent
Miami Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
P.O. Box 391
Miami, Oklahoma 74354
(Muskogee Area Office)

Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma (1)
Miami Tribe of Oklahoma (1)
Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma (1)
Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma (1) (Termination Pending) (70 Stat. 937)
Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma (1) (Termination Pending) (70 Stat. 893)
Quapaw Tribe of Indians (2)
Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma (6) (70 Stat. 963) Termination effective 1959

Superintendent
Shawnee Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Shawnee, Oklahoma 74801
(Anadarko Area Office)

Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma (1)
Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma (1)
Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma (1)
Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma (1)
Sac and Fox Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma (1)

Superintendent
Tahlequah Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
P.O. Box 459
Tahlequah, Oklahoma 74464
(Muskogee Area Office)

United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians in Oklahoma (1)
Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma (3)

Superintendent
Talihina Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
P.O. Box 187
Talihina, Oklahoma 74571
(Muskogee Area Office)

Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma (3)

Superintendent
Wewoka Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
P.O. Box 1060
Wewoka, Oklahoma 74834
(Muskogee Area Office)

Seminole Nation of Oklahoma (2)

Oregon

Superintendent
Nevada Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Stewart, Nevada 89437
(Phoenix Area Office)

Fort McDermit Paiute and Shoshone Tribe (in Nevada and Oregon) (1)

Superintendent
Umatilla Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Pendleton, Oregon 97801
(Portland Area Office)

Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (2)

Superintendent
Warm Springs Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Warm Springs, Oregon 97761
(Portland Area Office)

Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon (1)

Burns Paiute Indian Colony (2)

Other Groups in Oregon

(84) Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians (6) (68 Stat. 718) Termination effective 8-13-61

(85) Western Oregon Indians (6) (68 Stat. 724) Termination effective 8-18-56

Confederated Tribes of the Grand Rhonde Community
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians
Alsea
Applegate Creek
Calapooya
Chafton
Chempho
Chetco
Chetlessington
Chinook
Clackamas
Clatskanie
Clatsop
Clowwewalla
Coos
Cow Creek
Euchees
Galie Creek
Grave
Joshua
Karok
Kathlamet
Kusotony
Kwatami or Sixes
Lakmiut
Long Tom Creek
Lower Coquille
Lower Umpqua
Maddy
Mackanotin
Mary's River
Multnomah
Munsel Creek
Naltunnetunne
Nehalem
Nestucca
Northern Molalla
Port Orford
Pudding River
Rogue River
Salmon River
Santiam
Scoton
Shashta
Shasta Costa
Siletz
Siuslaw
Skiloot
Southern Molalla
Takelma
Tillamook
Tolowa
Tualatin
Tumwater
Tututui
Upper Coquille
Upper Umpqua
Willamette
Yamhill
Yaquina
Yoncalla

Pennsylvania

(19) Senecas of Cornplanter Reservation (8) (no population) (state established) (Some acreage exists which has not been condemned by the Kinzua Dam. The Cornplanter Senecas now live with the Seneca Nation of New York, or elsewhere. Voted not to reject the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934.)

Rhode Island

(61) Narraganset Community (7) Narraganset Church--Washington County. (Colonially derived; formerly state supervised. Some acreage left (non-taxable) around church.)

South Carolina

(22) Catawba Tribe (6) (State reservation remains) (73 Stat. 592) Termination effective 7-1-62

(61-A) Summerville Indians (7), Dorchester and Colleton Counties

South Dakota

Superintendent
Cheyenne River Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Eagle Butte, South
Dakota 57625
(Aberdeen Area Office)

Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe (1)

Superintendent
Crow Creek Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
P.O. Box 616
Fort Thompson, South
Dakota 57339
(Aberdeen Area Office)

Crow Creek Sioux Tribe of Fort Thompson (2)

Superintendent
Lower Brule Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Lower Brule, South
Dakota 57548
(Aberdeen Area Office)

Lower Brule Tribe of the Lower Brule Reservation (1)

Superintendent
Pine Ridge Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Pine Ridge, South
Dakota 57770
(Aberdeen Area Office)

Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation (1) (in South Dakota and Nebraska)

Superintendent
Rosebud Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Rosebud, South Dakota
57570
(Aberdeen Area Office)

Rosebud Sioux Tribe (1)

Superintendent
Sisseton Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Sisseton, South Dakota
57262
(Aberdeen Area Office)

Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe (2) (in North and South Dakota) (only a minor portion in North Dakota)

Superintendent
Standing Rock Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Fort Yates, North Dakota
58538
(Aberdeen Area Office)

Standing Rock Sioux Tribe (2) (in South Dakota and North Dakota)

Superintendent
Yankton Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Wagner, South Dakota
57380
(Aberdeen Area Office)

Yankton Sioux Tribe of Indians (2)

Superintendent
Flandreau School
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Flandreau, South Dakota
57028
(Aberdeen Area Office)

Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe (1)

Texas

(25) Alabama and Coushatta Tribes of Texas (6) (68 Stat. 768) Termination effective 7-1-55 State reservation in Polk County (Most Coushattas live near but off the reservation)

(26) Tiwa Indians of Ysleta, Texas (7) (82 Stat. 93) (El Paso County)

Utah

Superintendent
Fort Hall Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Fort Hall, Idaho 83203
(Portland Area Office)

Northwestern Band of Shoshone Indians (Washakie) (4)

Superintendent
Nevada Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Stewart, Nevada 89437
(Phoenix Area Office)

Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation (1) (in Nevada and Utah)

Superintendent
Shiprock Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Shiprock, New Mexico 87420
(Navajo Area Office)

Navajo Nation (2) (in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah)

(Districts and Chapters)

Dist. 9

Mexican Water (in Utah and Arizona)

Red Mesa (in Utah and Arizona)

Teecnospos (in New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah)

Superintendent
Tuba City Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Tuba City, Arizona 86045
(Navajo Area Office)

Navajo Nation (2) (in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah)

(Districts and Chapters)

Dist. 2

Navajo Mountain (in Utah and Arizona)

Shonto (in Utah and Arizona)

Dist. 9

Chilchinbeto (in Utah and Arizona)

Dennehotso (in Utah and Arizona)

Kayenta (in Utah and Arizona)

Oljatoh (in Utah and Arizona)

Superintendent
Uintah and OUray Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Fort Duchesne, Utah 84026
(Phoenix Area Office)

Ute Indian Tribe of Uintah and Ouray (1)

Skull Valley (3)

Superintendent
Ute Mountain Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Towaoc, Colorado 81334
(Albuquerque Area Office)

Ute Mountain Ute Tribe (1) (in Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah--(Utah portion--scattered tracts occupied by the Allen Canyon Utes near Blanding, Utah.)

Other Groups in Utah

(62) Southern Paiutes at Cedar City, Utah (7) (A group of informally organized Southern Paiute Indians with no trust land base. They reside on property owned by the Mormon Church.)

Paiute Indians of Utah (6) (68 Stat. 1099) Termination effective 3-1-57
- (88) Indian Peaks
- (89) Kanosh
- (90) Koosharem
- (91) Shivwitz

(92) Affiliated Ute Citizens of Uintah and Ouray (6) (68 Stat. 868) Termination effective 8-27-61.

Virginia

(63) Chickahominy Communities (7) (Providence Forge and Charles City)

(20) Mattaponi (7) State reservation

(21) Pamunkey (7) State reservation

(64) Potomac Community (7) (Fredericksburg)

(65) Rappahanock Community (7) (Caroline, King and Queen Counties)

(66) Upper Mattaponi (7) (The town of Central Garage in King William County)

Washington

Superintendent
Colville Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Coulee Dam, Washington
99116
(Portland Area Office)

Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation (2)

Superintendent
Northern Idaho Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Lapwai, Idaho 83540
(Portland Area Office)

Kalispel Indian Community (1) (in Washington)

Superintendent
Spokane Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Wellpinit, Washington
99040
(Portland Area Office)

Spokane Tribe (2)

Superintendent
Western Washington Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
3006 Colby Avenue
Everett, Washington
98201
(Portland Area Office)

Hoh Indian Tribe (1)
Lower Elwha Tribal Community (1)
Makah Indian Tribe (1)
Muckleshoot Indian Tribe (1)
Nisqually Indian Community (1)
Port Gamble Indian Community (1)
Puyallup Tribe (1)
Quileute Tribe of Indians (1)
Skokomish Indian Tribe (1)
Squaxin Island Tribe (1)
Suquamish Indian Tribe (1)
Swinomish Indian Tribal Community (1)
Tulalip Tribes (1)

Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation (2)
Lummi Tribe of Indians (2)
Quinault Tribe of Indians (2)
Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribal Organization (2)
Nooksack Indian Tribe (3)
Sauk-Suiattle Indian Community (3)
Upper Skagit Indians (3)

Chinook Indians (5)
Cowlitz Indians (5)
Duwamish Indians (5)
Jamestown Band of Clallam Indians (5)
Kikiallus Indians (5)
Lower Skagit (5)
Samish Tribe of Indians (5)
San Juan Tribe (5)
Snohomish Indian Tribe (5)
Snoqualmie Indian Tribe (5)
Steilacoom Indian Tribe (5)
Stillaguamish Indian Tribe (5)

Superintendent
Yakima Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Toppenish, Washington
98948
(Portland Area Office)

Yakima Indian Nation (2)

Wisconsin

Superintendent
Great Lakes Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Ashland, Wisconsin 54806
(Minneapolis Area Office)

Bad River Band of the Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin (1)
Bay Mills Indian Community (1) (in Michigan)
Forest County Potawatomi Community (1)
Hannahville Indian Community (1) (in Michigan)
Keweenaw Bay Indian Community (L'Anse Reservation) (1) (in Michigan)
Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians (1)
Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians (1)
Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin (1)
Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians (1)
Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe (Isabella Reservation) (1) (in Michigan)
Sokaogon Chippewa Community (Mole Lake) (1)
St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin (1)
Stockbridge Munsee Community (1)
Wisconsin Winnebago Tribe (1) (in Minnesota and Wisconsin)

Other Groups in Wisconsin

(67) Brotherton Community
(7) Winnebago and Calamut Counties
(93) Menominee Tribe (6)
(68 Stat. 250) Termination effective 4-30-61

Wyoming

Superintendent
Wind River Agency
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Fort Washakie, Wyoming
82514
(Billings Area Office)

Northern Arapaho (3)
Shoshone (3)

Area Offices

Aberdeen Area Office
Bureau of Indian Affairs
820 South Main St.
Aberdeen, S. Dak. 57401
(Nebr., N. Dak, and S. Dak.

Albuquerque Area Office
Bureau of Indian Affairs
5301 Central Ave. NE.
P.O. Box 8327
Albuquerque, N. Mex. 87108
(Colo., N. Mex.)

Anadarko Area Office
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Federal Bldg.
P.O. Box 368
Anadarko, Okla 73005
(Kans. and Western Okla.)

Billings Area Office
Bureau of Indian Affairs
316 North 26th St.
Billings, Mont. 59101
(Mont. and Wyo.)

Juneau Area Office
Bureau of Indian Affairs
P.O. Box 3-8000
Juneau, Alaska 99801
(Alaska)

Minneapolis Area Office
Bureau of Indian Affairs
831 Second Ave. South
Minneapolis, Minn. 55402
(Minn., Iowa, Mich., and Wisc.)

Muskogee Area Office
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Federal Bldg.
Muskogee, Okla. 74401
(Eastern Okla.)

Navajo Area Office
Bureau of Indian Affairs
P.O. Box 1060
Window Rock, Ariz. 86515
(Ariz., Utah, and New Mex.)

Phoenix Area Office
Bureau of Indian Affairs
124 West Thomas Rd.
P.O. Box 7007
Phoenix, Ariz. 85011

Portland Area Office
Bureau of Indian Affairs
1425 Irving St. NE.
P.O. Box 3735
Portland, Oreg. 97208
(Oreg., Wash., and Idaho)

Sacramento Area Office
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Federal Office Bldg.
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, Calif. 95825

Director, Southeastern Agencies
Bureau of Indian Affairs
1951 Constitution Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20242

New York Coordinator
Bureau of Indian Affairs
1951 Constitution Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20242

Federal Indian Policies

...from the Colonial period through the early 1970's

Our country's first administrator of Federal Indian policies, Henry Knox, said at the time of his appointment as a Cabinet officer in George Washington's Administration:

> "That the civilization of the Indians would be an operation of complicated difficulty; that it would require the highest knowledge of the human character and a steady perseverance in a wise system for a series of years, cannot be doubted. But to deny that, under a course of favorable circumstances, it could be accomplished, is to suppose the human character under the influence of such stubborn habits as to be incapable of melioration or change."

In the early colonial period the Indians represented a strong balance of power between the forces of Spain, France, and England and were therefore treated as sovereign nations until the issue of North American domination was settled.

Until 1755, the individual English colonies had no coordinated policies on Indian affairs. During that year the British developed an Indian policy designed to: (1) protect the Indians from opportunistic traders and speculators; (2) negotiate boundary lines by treaties; (3) enlist the Indians on the side of the British in the French and Indian War; and (4) exercise as much control as possible over fur trade.

King George III in 1763 proclaimed: "The several nations or tribes of nations, with whom we are connected, should not be molested or disturbed in the possession of such parts of our dominions and territories, as, not having been ceded to, or purchased by us, are reserved to them, or any of them, as hunting grounds."

The proclamation by King George III defined the "Indian country" to be administered by two superintendents, one north and one south, and set aside "reserved lands" for the Indians. The two superintendents took on the role of diplomatic agents negotiating with the various tribes by means of a series of treaties.

The leadership of Benjamin Franklin is of historical importance to the development of this and subsequent periods of Indian affairs. He proposed, at the Albany Congress of 1754, that all colonial Indian affairs be centrally administered. The Franklin plan was a forerunner of later centrally administered British Indian policy under the two superintendents and of centralized Indian policy under the new American Government.

The outbreak of hostilities between the Americans and the British in April, 1775, pitted tribe against tribe and produced strenuous efforts for Indian alliances by both colonial and imperial governments. The young American revolutionary government attempted to win the friendship of the Indians through treaties. But most of the tribes supported George III, and even tribal neutrality was counted a success by the colonists.

The Continental Congress, in one of its first actions, named a Committee on Indian Affairs in 1775. This committee produced a report a month later which prompted the Congress to set up "three departments of Indians" - the Northern, Middle, and Southern. The Congress continued many of the policies of Colonial times as well as creating new ones. Included among the outstanding Americans serving as commissioners of the Indian Departments were Benjamin Franklin and Patrick Henry in the Middle Department, and General Philip Schuyler in the Northern Department.

The Indian Commissioners were given authority "to treat with the Indians...in order to preserve peace and friendship with them and to prevent their taking part in the present commotions." The first negotiation was with the Six Nations (Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga, Seneca, and Tuscarora) in July, 1775, and called for employment of two blacksmiths among the Indians and the opening of trade.

The first of 370 Indian tribes to be concluded during the next century was with the Delawares on September 17, 1778. This treaty held out the possibility that an Indian state might later be established as one of the states in the new country. This idea reappeared many times as an ultimate goal for Indian policy, without substantial result.

During the Revolutionary War, the Indian commissioners acted primarily as diplomatic agents, negotiating with various Indian tribes to gain their allegiance. Their work was kept under the authority of the Congress until a year after the war ended.

The Beginning of Forced Removal

In 1784 the Congress of the Confederation placed the administration of Indian affairs within the War Department, with the Secretary of War directed to place armed militia at the disposal of the Indian commissioners "for negotiating treaties with the Indians."

The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 was important in establishing the framework for settlement beyond the Alleghenies and in shaping Indian policy. It provided that:

> "The utmost good faith shall always be observed toward the Indians; their land and property, rights and liberty, they shall never be invaded or disturbed unless in just and lawful wars authorized by Congress; but laws founded in justice and humanity shall from time to time be made for preventing peace and friendship with them."

Over the next 50 years, the new Nation and its government grew stronger. Laws regulating the trade between whites and Indians were added to the books, and a network of Indian agents and subagents was established following a report relating to military administration of trade practices with Indians. The report called for legislation "to ensure faithful disbursement of public money" and to enforce "prompt settlement of accounts."

In 1824, Secretary of War John C. Calhoun had begun to tie together all Federal Indian activities under an Indian Affairs Agency. He saw the Federal role as providing for: (1) appropriations for tribal annuities to be made to tribes for lands they had lost; (2) examination of Indian claims relating to trade laws; (3) bookkeeping; (4) correspondence with Indian superintendents and agents; and (5) administration of a fund for the civilization of Indians.

Meanwhile the systematic forced removal of Indian groups from the choice eastern lands to the western wilderness across the Mississippi had begun. Nearly all the Cherokees in the lower Appalachian area were driven across the mountains to settle in the Indian Territory. This territory, carved from the Louisiana Purchase, was created by President Thomas Jefferson, who expressed the hope that the removal of Indian groups from heavily settled eastern regions would contribute to their advancement.

The "removal" policy had been precipitated by activity in the late 1820's within the State of Georgia. The Cherokee Tribe in that State, a highly advanced civilization, had adopted an Indian constitution: appeals made by the Cherokees eventually resulted in a U.S. Supreme Court decision nullifying Georgia's action.

Chief Justice John Marshall's decision recognized that earlier Congresses had passed laws "which treat (Indians) as nations" and "as distinct political communities, having territorial boundaries."

The Indian Removal Act of 1830 established procedures for voluntary exchange of eastern Indian lands for new western acreage that was to be held by the tribes under perpetual guaranty from the Federal Government.

In 1834 Congress gave regular and permenent status to the Indian Affairs office and it began carrying out President Andrew Jackson's directive to remove all Indians living east of the Mississippi River to new western lands. These removal policies relied more on military force than diplomatic treaty.

The Five Civilized Tribes -- Cherokees, Chickasaws, Choctaws, Creeks, and Seminoles--were pressured by negotiations and threat of force to move westward to the new Indian Territory. Although some members of these Tribes resisted, most became established in the new lands and were among the first citizens of Oklahoma when statehood was proclaimed.

Other Indian tribes from the northeast and Great Lakes regions also were subjected to the removal policies. Removal was justified by the Federal Government as a means of protecting the Indians from repeated encroachments of eastern white settlers. The Government policy bitterly divided the country--in the Congress, among the religious groups, in the press, and among Indians themselves.

"In the consummation of this grand and sacred object rests the sole chance of averting Indian annihilation," argued Commissioner of Indian Affairs Elbert Herring, in 1832.

Another Indian Commissioner, George Manypenny, 1854, urged the abandonment of the removal policy.

"By alternate persuasion and force," Manypenny said, "some of these tribes have been removed, step by step, from mountains to valley, and from river to plain, until they have been pushed half-way across the continent. They can go no further. On the ground they now occupy, the crisis must be met, and their future determined.

Many of those people who sympathized with the plight of the survivors of Eastern tribes who were now settled west of the Mississippi, thought they were doing these people a good turn by removing them from civilization's path until they could acquire the skills and knowledge necessary for assimilation.

The Start of Indian Education Programs

A number of separate treaties with Indian tribes had set the precedent for placing responsibility for Indian education in the hands of the Government. One of the first of these treaties was with the Oneidas, Stockbridges, and Tuscaroras in 1794. Two years earlier the famed Seneca Chief, Cornplanter, visited President Washington, asking the Government to "teach our children to read and write and our women to spin and weave." A Federal directive to provide the "blessings of civilization" to Indians through treaties was issued in that year.

A "civilization fund" was contained in a law passed by Congress in 1819 which appropriated $10,000 annually to Indians. All funds provided by this act were channeled through religious and mission groups combined later in the 1840's to launch the first Indian boarding school system. Not until 1860 was the first non-mission Federal Indian school started. (Congressional Acts of 1896, 1897, and 1917 eventually established that no further Federal funds for education could go to sectarian schools.)

Civil Administration Begins in Mid-Century

Repeated efforts were made in the Jacksonian period to regularize Federal Indian administration through legisiation. The War Department's head of Indian Affairs reported in 1828, that there were "fruitful sources of complaint" due to the lack of an organized system. In 1834 Congress passed a Trade and Intercourse Act setting up an Office of Indian Affairs, and modernizing trade practices as the result of a report in 1829 by two experienced Indian affairs specialists, Lewis Cass and William Clark.

Both Clark (of Lewis and Clark Expedition fame) and Cass had been territorial governors in Indian country for many years and Clark also had been superintendent of Indian affairs at St. Louis. Cass was to become Secretary of War in 1831. Their report called for new legislation "to ensure a faithful disbursement of the public money" and "to enforce a strict accountability and a prompt settlement of accounts."

Noting the increased lands to be supervised by a still-growing United States, and the need for establishing peaceable relations with the Indians, Treasury Secretary Robert J. Walker voiced the sentiment of many who advocated transfer of the Bureau of Indian Affairs from the War Department to a new Department, soon to take shape as the Department of the Interior.

Walker said: "The duties now performed by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs are most numerous and important, and must be vastly increased with the great number of tribes scattered over Texas, Oregon, New Mexico and California, and with the interesting progress of so many of the tribes in Christianity, knowledge, and civilization. These duties do not necessarily appertain to war, but to peace, and to our domestic relations with those tribes placed by the Constitution under the charge of this Government."

By 1849, with creation of the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Indian Affairs passed from military to civil control. Its work consisted of attempts at "civilizing" the Indian people by training them for farming or trades. In 1862, Secretary of the Interior Caleb Smith recommended a "radical change in the mode of treatment of Indians" to regard them as "wards" of the Government. Consequently, the Bureau's efforts were often in conflict with military policy and it sometimes became the uneasy and unhappy buffer between the Indians and the U.S. Army.

The Call For Peace

The removal policy had succeeded in large measure with the Five Civilized Tribes because they envisioned an Indian nation, fully sovereign and federated. But many of the Plains Indians resisted all military moves to relocate them. They possessed the white man's horse and gun and fought bitterly against further encroachments on their lands and their way of life.

Tensions grew between Indians and whites in the western territories in the late 1850's and throughout the 1860's, as the railroads began moving west, culminating in a series of Indian "uprisings" and a Congressional demand that peace prevail in Indian country. After the Civil War, Congress authorized establishment of an Indian Peace Commission, comprising four civilians and three military leaders including Indian Commissioner Nathanel G. Taylor and General William Tecumseh Sherman.

Peace Commission field trips had disclosed considerable corruption among Indian agents. Its report of 1867 stated: "The records are abundant to show that agents have pocketed the funds appropriated by the Government and driven the Indians to starvation." It blamed Indian agent corruption or incompetence for creating Indian incidents, notably the 1862 Sioux uprising in Minnesota.

Two separate actions were taken by the Federal Government to produce reforms in Indian policy. In 1869 a Board of Indian Commissioners was named and charged by Congress with the responsibility for advising the Secretary of the Interior on matters relating to Indian affairs. President Grant at the same time requested religious organizations to nominate Indian agency superintendents. The Board of Indian Commissioners, lacking any policy-making authority, was continued until 1933, when it was abandoned by President Franklin D. Roosevelt's executive order, nominating of Indian

Bureau agents by religious groups was discontinued a few years after it was begun.

In 1867 and 1868 the Indian Peace Commission negotiated the last of 370 Indian treaties. These required tribes of the Upper Great Plains, the Southwest, and the Northwest to settle on various reservations in the West. The last treaty, signed with the Nez Perce of Oregon on August 12, 1868, removed the tribe to a new reservation in Idaho.

The U.S. Congress, on March 3, 1871, finished the Indian treaty period with a clause tacked to a Congressional appropriation for the Yankton Indians: ".....hereafter no Indian nation or tribe within the territory of the United States shall be acknowledged or recognized as an independent nation, tribe, or power with whom the United States shall contract by treaty."

Ironically, it was a mixed-blood Seneca Indian, Eli S. Parker, said to be the grandson of the warrior Red Jacket, who presided over the Indian Bureau when the last chapter in the history of treaty-making was written. Parker was a professional engineer, recognized authority on the Iroquois League and personal secretary to General Ulysses S. Grant in the Civil War.

The Reservation System

Twenty years of intermittent warfare followed the signing of the last Indian treaty before the last of the Western Indians were moved to reservations. Geronimo's surrender in the southwest in 1886 and the battle of Wounded Knee in South Dakota in 1890 followed numerous Federal military victories in the southwest, Dakotas and Oregon, and marked the end of serious resistance to relocation policies.

The reservation system brought a new set of woes to the Indians, as the Government pressured them into relinquishing customs and culture.

Chieftainship, which had been encouraged since Colonial days as a means of tribal control, was not attacked directly. Instead, chiefs were by passed while law and order was delegated to tribal police forces and Courts of Indian Offenses. The result was a gradual breakdown of tradition upon which the Indian had always leaned heavily, with nothing to replace it.

Native religions were discouraged, some ceremonies forbidden, and Christian missionaries encouraged. Particularly vicious were the attacks upon Indian "prophets" which culminated in the battle of Wounded Knee in 1890.

Commissioner Francis Walker (1871-73) set the tone of the "forced reservation" period, which lasted until 1887, stating that, when the reservation system began, "it was expressly declared that the Indians should be made as comfortable on, and uncomfortable off, their reservations as it was within the power of the Government to make them; that such of them as went right should be protected and fed, and such as went wrong should be harassed and scourged without intermission."

Those Indians who "went wrong"-such as the Apaches under Cochise in the early 1870's, the Sioux led by Crazy Horse and Sitting Bull in the mid-1870's, and the Nez Perce with Chief Joseph a short while later-were "harassed and scourged without intermission," conquered eventually and returned to reservations.

Those Indians who "went right," were, as Walker promised, "protected and fed" through a new practice of furnishing daily food rations and clothing to Indians, instituted as a by-product of the Indian peace treaties of the late 1860's and continued by the Indian Bureau until well into the 1920's.

The rations practice was the forerunner of special aids for Indians which continue to this day. The giving of rations was defended by Commissioner Walker:

"Can any principle of national morality be dearer than that when the expansion and development of a civilized race involve the rapid destruction of the only means of subsistence possessed by members of a less fortunate race, the higher is bound as a simple right to provide for the lower some substitute for the means of subsistence which it has destroyed? That substitute is, of course, best realized, not by systematic gratuities of food and clothing continued beyond a present emergency, but by directing these people to new pursuits which shall be consistent with the progress of civilization upon the continent."

There were contrary views, too. Indian Agent, V.T. McGillicuddy, on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota, later commented.

"What reason or inducement can be advanced why an Indian should go to work and earn his own living by the sweat of his brow, when an indulgent Government furnishes him more than he wants to eat and clothes him for nothing?"

The "wardship" approach prevailed, with the pace set by Secretary of the Interior Caleb Smith. Education for farming and trades became a goal.

45

A start in providing health services to Indians had come in 1832 through funds authorized by Congress for smallpox vaccination of certain tribes. By the 1870's health services had expanded to include medical doctors on various reservations in an effort to combat the ravages of disease that were taking a heavy toll of the Indian population.

As the 19th Century came to a close, steps had been taken to launch programs of education and land resource development. Two vocational schools--Haskell Institute in Kansas and Chilocco Indian School in Oklahoma--opened in 1884; and five years later a broader education program was instituted at the Carlisle Indian School in Pennsylvania.

On the land development side, some tribal groups were encouraged to enter into livestock grazing, although these enterprises were not highly successful among the nomadic groups, and overgrazing and loss of stock were common. Some irrigation of Indian lands was attempted--as early as 1876 on the Colorado River Reservation in Arizona--but this project was later abandoned. Even into the 20th Century, irrigation and conservation measure on Indian lands lagged behind the national efforts as a whole.

The Land Allotment Period

All of these Indian programs, the initial phases of the broad "civilizing" process, came at the height of a long Indian Bureau and Congressional push for helping Indians to become "self-supporting" by allowing the Indian lands to be subdivided to individual Indians through what is known as allotment in severalty--or individual ownership of small pieces of land.

Dating back to 1633, when the General Court of Massachusetts Colony provided for Indians to receive "allotments amongst the English," there had been slowly growing advocacy of an allotment policy for Indians.

It was in the 1850's that the Federal Government reached its peak in Indian land title extinguishment and began to spell out more clearly in the next 30 years a growing preference for the allotment policy which at last was approved by Congress in 1887.

"In no former equal period of our history have so many treaties been made, or such vast accession of land obtained," Commissioner George Manypenny said in 1857. Through 52 separate treaties from 1853 to 1857 a total of 174 million acres of Indian land was acquired by the United States Government.

Many allotments of land were provided through treaty to individual Indians, and for the next 30 years each succeeding Commissioner of Indian Affairs (except Francis A. Walker in the 1870's) favored the policy of subdividing the large tribal-held lands into small pieces owned individually.

The Indian Allotment Act, introduced in Congress by Sentaor Henry L. Dawes of Massachusetts, was passed in 1887. Its intent was to assimilate the Indian by giving him individual ownership of land, as opposed to the collective land use and possession practiced by most Indian groups. Under the plan, small pieces of tribal land--from 40 to 160 acres--would be allotted to Indian families or individuals. Within 25 years, in a manner similar to that of the Homestead Act, the Indian, if adjudged "competent," would be given the land to use as he saw fit and would also acquire full citizenship status. However, before the 25 years had elapsed, the Burke Act (1906) permitted those Indians adjudged "competent" to acquire ownership at once.

The result of nearly 50 years of the allotment policy was to reduce the Indian land holdings from over 140 million acres in 1886 to under 50 million acres in 1934. Thousands of Indians receiving these allotments sold them to non-Indians who had the financial means and business abilities to develop the lands.

This sale or rental of land tended to increase the Indian's dependence upon Government support. In many cases rental income was too small or sale funds soon exhausted and the Indian was forced to turn back to the Government for assistance. In addition, the demands of this newly imposed civilization were often contrary to Indian culture and created psychological conflicts that still persist.

In the first decade of the 20th Century the Bureau of Indian Affairs embarked on further land development programs--in establishing services of conservation, reclamation and forestry--all designed to complement execution of the allotment policy.

The Road To Citizenship

The determination of Indian "competency" was carried out as part of Federal Indian policy well into the 1920's, and was highlighted by a 1917 "Declaration of Policy" by Commisioner Cato Sells and Interior Secretary Franklin Lane, which stated: "The time has come for discontinuing guardianship over all competent Indians and giving even closer attention to the incompetents that they more speedily achieve competency."

To determine whether an Indian is "as competent to transact his own business as the average white man," a practice of issuing "certification of competency" was established, and a network of "competency commissions was created.

This approach was hailed by Commissioner Sells as indicating that "the competent Indian will no longer be treated as half ward and half citizen." Because of the growing number of Indians who obtained citizenship through allotment and because of a national appreciation for the record of Indian volunteers in World War I, the Indian Bureau began a push for full Indian citizenship. In 1924 Congress passed the Indian Citizenship Act, granting citizenship to all Indians who had not previously acquired it.

The Attack on the Allotment System

Increasing public agitation for reforms in the administration of Indian affairs led Interior Secretary Hubert Work in 1926 to request the Institute of Government Research (the Brookings Institution) to study the Federal Indian policies. He asked for recommendations that would "embrace the education, industrial, social and medical activities maintained among the Indians, their property rights, and their general economic conditions." An institute staff headed by Lewis Meriam produced the lengthy document in 1928 to be known as the Meriam Report which called for these basic Indian policy reforms:

1. "Establishment of a professional and scientific Division of Planning and Development to hasten agricultural advances, vocational guidance, job placement, and other aspects of economic development on the reservations.
2. "A material strengthening of the school and reservation forces that are in direct contact with the Indians and are responsible for developing and improving their economic and social condition through education in the broadest sense of the word" by deemphasizing the boarding school practice of taking children out of their tribal environment and accelerating development of a day school system on the reservations.
3. "Maximum practical decentralization of authority" from the central office to the local agency offices, plus better salaries for Indian Bureau personnel and enlisting more Indians into career Indian administration.

Of the allotment law, the Meriam Report charged:

> "When the Government adopted the policy of individual ownership of land on the reservations, the expectation was that the Indians would become farmers. Part of the plan was to instruct and aid them in agriculture, but this vital part was not pressed with vigor and intelligence. It almost seems as if the Government assumed that some magic in individual ownership of property would in itself prove an educational civilizing factor, but unfortunately this policy has for the most part operated in the opposite direction. "Individual ownership in many instances permitted Indians to sell their allotments and to live for a time on the unearned income resulting from the sale. Individual ownership brought promptly all the details of inheritance, and frequently the sale of the property of the deceased Indians to whites so that the estate could be divided among the heirs. To the heirs the sale brought further unearned income, thereby lessening the necessity of self support."

The report also proposed that Indians be permitted leasing rights in order to add enough land to their own allotments to make an efficient farm or ranch. This policy would counteract the easier tendency to lease these same lands to whites, a policy which deterred active land management by Indians. Furthermore, leasing to whites "gave the Indians unearned income to permit the continuance of a life of idleness," the study concluded.

Indian Reorganization Period
1934-1961

The Congress responded to the Meriam Report with passage of reform legislation in 1934-the Indian Reorganization Act).

It brought a halt to the process of allotment, prohibited unrestricted sales of Indian land, and provided for acquisition of additional lands by tribes and individuals. It created a foundation for tribal economic self-sufficiency by the establishment of constitutional tribal governments, the extension of credit from Federal funds, the fostering of tribal enterprises, and the institution of modern conservation and resource development practices. The keynote became cooperation between Indian tribes and the Federal Government to achieve change without forcing it.

The new Wheeler-Howard Act marks a decisive shift of direction of American Indian policy, and endeavors to give the Indians not only a broad measure of economic assistance but also those "national rights of man" mentioned by President Roosevelt in his letter of endorsement sent to Congress, it stops far short of the ultimate goal. It is merely a beginning in the process of liberating and rejuvenating a subjugated and exploited race living in the midst of an aggressive civilization far ahead, materially speaking, of its own."

From the perspective of two decades later, the Committee on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government (Hoover Commission) summarized the impact of the Meriam Report and the resulting 1934 Indian Reorganization Act as follows:

> "In the years immediately following the Meriam Report there was marked progress in professionalizing the Indian Service through better personnel, improved methods, and higher professional standards. Indian education was modernized and a stronger and better coordinated economic program got underway.
>
> In the 1930's these activities were carried forward vigorously. The Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) has given further impetus to the economic program by authorizing enlargement of Indian lands, extending the leading function, and establishing a policy of scientific range and forest management."

The IRA also paved the way for revival of tribal organization, and establishment of tribal law.

Aside from the Wheeler-Howard Act, other significant Indian legislation of the 1930's included the Johnson-O'Malley Act of 1934 and the creation in 1935 of an Indian Arts and Crafts Board within the Department of the Interior.

The Johnson-O'Malley Act provided Federal educational funds to assist States and local districts, and brought about an expansion of the practice of educating Indian children in the public school system. The Arts and Crafts Board revived interest in native crafts as a means of livelihood for Indian people.

The Indian Extension Service program began providing modern technical assistance to Indians in the fields of conservation, irrigation, grazing and dry-farming. An Indian credit program was launched with a revolving loan fund.

But the big development of the whole period was the start of tribal self-government, with several hundred reservation tribal groups determining by popular vote to govern themselves in a democratic manner with modern constitutions. Today's tribal council form of Indian government largely stems from this Act, although a number of Indian tribes had maintained constitutional self-government prior to 1934, and still others rejected the self-governing feature contained in the Indian Reorganization Act.

Effects of World War II

World War II, to a great extent, changed both the Indian way of life and Federal Indian policy directions. Nearly 70,000 Indian men and women left reservations for the first time to go into military service and defense industries. The Indian record in both instances was widely praised.

The war produced both new skills and a greater degree of cultural sophistication than had ever before been achieved by large numbers of Indians. But it also brought post-war demands for assistance in Indian vocational training and relocation, for expanded education and for reservation economic development.

The post-war period brought on the "area office" system of decentralized Indian Bureau administration. Many development projects--roads, irrigation and building construction--were resumed in 1946, after being stalled during the war.

The fifteen-year post-war period also saw: (1) greatly increased programs to aid education of the Nation's largest tribe, the Navajos. (A study in 1947 showed that nearly 75 percent of all Navajo children were not in school); (2) a ten-year economic development and rehabilitation fund for the Navajos and Hopis to bring much needed capital investment to this poverty-stricken region of the southwest; (3) development of Federal Indian programs of employment assistance, including vocational training and on-the-job training to Indian workers; (4) a start on Indian adult education for those Indians who had missed the elementary education now being expanded for their children; and (5) the beginnings of an Indian industrial development program to encourage private business and industry to locate in Indian areas.

Establishment of Indian Claims Commission

The Indian Claims Commission was created in 1946 to permit Indians to file suits against the Government. The Commission received a total of 852 claims in 370 petitions entered during the five years allowed for filing. Any "identifiable" groups of Indians within the United States or Alaska--then still a territory--could take their claims to this Commission. It was empowered to hear and adjudicate suits arising from claims in law or equity; tort claims; claims based on fraud, duress, unconscionable consideration, mutual or lateral mistake; claims based upon fair and honorable dealings not recognized by existing rules or law or equity; or claims based on the taking of land without payment of the agreed compensation.

Commissioner Collier and others hoped the settlement of claims would enable the Indians to become socially and economically assimilated into the fabric of American life. By November 1969, about one-half of the claims had been adjudicated, and settlements exceeding $305 million made. Although in some instances the judgments resulted in a per capita distribution of funds, many tribal awards have remained largely intact with the money "programmed" for community and economic development.

Congress has directed the Commission to complete the task of hearing and determining the claims before it by April 10, 1972.

New Trends of the 1950's

Revival of pressures for Federal termination of trusteeship responsibilities occurred with the Hoover Commission's recommendation that programs be developed to terminate "the trust status of Indian lands."

Among members of the Hoover Commission's committee on Indian affairs was John Nichols, who became Indian Affairs Commissioner in 1949.

House Concurrent Resolution 108 of the 83rd Congress in 1953 led to passage in the next few years of a number of termination bills. Introduced by Representative William H. Harrison of Wyoming and by Senator Arthur V. Watkins of Utah (who later became Chairman of the Indian Claims Commission), the termination resolution read in part:

> "It is the policy of Congress, as rapidly as possible, to make the Indians within the territorial limits of the United States subject to the same laws and entitled to the same privileges and responsibilities as are applicable to other citizens of the United States, and to grant them all the rights and prerogatives pertaining to American citizenship......"

On June 17, 1954 the Menominees of Wisconsin became the first tribe slated for termination of Federal trusteeship. The tribe had a large investment in forest lands and tribal sawmill. The Menominee Reservation was to be fully removed from Federal trust status on December 31, 1958, although later Congressional Acts delayed final termination until April 30, 1961.

Other tribes "terminated" by law in this period were the Klamaths and Western Oregon Indians; four small bands in Utah; the Alabama-Coushattas of Texas; the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska the Uintah and Ouray Ute Mixed Bloods of Utah; the Wyandottes, Ottawas, and Peorias of Oklahoma. Termination proceedings have been moving on a piecemeal basis under legislation passed in 1958 for the Indian rancherias throughout the State of California.

Strong opposition to termination from among some Indian tribes and others led to a statement by Interior Secretary Fred Seaton, who declared in 1958: "It would be incredible, even criminal, to send any Indian tribe out into the mainstream of American life until and unless the educational level of that tribe was one which was equal to the responsibilities which it was shouldering."

The 1950's produced several other important new legislative directions affecting Indian policy:

1. Indian lands in three States and part of two others were brought under State Civil and criminal jurisdiction by an Act of August, 1953,

2. The prohibition was lifted against the sale of alcoholic beverages to Indians outside Indian country and a local option system was established within reservations, also in 1953;

3. The Division of Indian Health was transferred effective July 1, 1955, from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the U.S. Public Health Service. Notable progress has subsequently been made in reducing the Indian life span, and curtailing the severity of many illnesses.

The record in Federal Indian relations over two decades was summarized in the late 1950's by the noted anthropologist and Pulitzer Prize winning author, the late Oliver LaFarge, as follows:

"The progress has been great, and it has been spotty. You cannot make over a race in 25 years, despite what the allotment theorists believed. It takes more than one generation to make the jump from a home in which no English is spoken, where the thinking is the same as it was 300 years ago, to full competence in our alien and complex way of life. If, while the Indians are struggling desperately to make the great adjustment, the last remnants of their land base are lost to them; if, as they fear, the Indian Reorganization Act will be junked some day, their struggle will be hopeless. It is the Government's responsibility to enable (Indians) to keep and use what they already have, to allow them an ordinary choice, and not the flat alternatives of migrate or starve."

New Direction in the 1960's

A "New Trail" for Indians leading to equal citizenship rights and benefits, maximum self-sufficiency, and full participation in American life, became the keynote for administration of the programs for the Bureau of Indian Affairs after the close of fiscal year 1961.

This keynote was provided in a report to the Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, by a special task force on Indian affairs, which he appointed in February, 1961.

To move toward the accomplishments of these goals, the task force recommended less emphasis on the purely custodial functions of the Bureau, greater concentration of time, energy, and funds on fostering fuller development of both the human and natural resources on Indian reservation.

Probably the most important single recommendation was a shift in program emphasis away from termination of Federal trust relationship.

This was coupled, however, with a recommendation that eligibility for special services be withdrawn from Indians with substantial incomes and superior educational experience who are as competent as most non-Indians to look after their own affairs.

An administrative reorganization was accomplished--not only in Washington but in area offices and agencies-combining in one new Division of Economic Development all operating units directly concerned with economic development. The resources functions of the Bureau were brought into closer relationship with the industrial development work and the revolving credit program. In the Washington office, the new division also included a program planning staff and a specialist in housing. In later years, the housing activity was transferred to the Division of Community Services.

A program to improve Indian housing, a product of the 1960's, opened up Indian reservations to the housing agencies to non-reservation areas. Indian tribes established local housing authorities as a first step in qualifying for Federal housing assistance under the programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The Indian housing program is slowly and steadily gaining a foothold on the reservations.

To alleviate Indian unemployment, the Bureau also increased attention to job opportunities, through expanded programs in adult vocational training, voluntary relocation of Indians for employment in urban centers, industrial development on or near the reservations, and increased use of Indian labor by the Bureau on needed work in road maintenance and construction, repair and maintenance of bulidings, and construction of buildings and utilities, all of which provided the Indians valuable construction training. Projects launched under the 1963 Accelerated Public Works Program on nearly 100 reservations provided useful work for thousands of tribal members and contributed importantly to the protection and development of Indian timber stands and other physical resources.

The declaration of war on poverty, first enunciated by President Johnson in his State of the Union message to the Congress in January 1964, was followed by his assurances to tribal leaders that Indian poverty was to be a major target. The Bureau of Indian Affairs was fully committed in the battle to drive poverty from American Indian reservation communities. Education and economic development were the major fronts in the war on poverty.

This period saw substantial progress in involvement of other agencies of the Federal Government in providing meaningful programs among the Indian people. They included the Departments of Labor; Commerce; Health, Education, and Welfare; Housing and Urban Development; and Office of Economic Opportunity.

The programs for the disadvantaged under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 have provided the Indians an opportunity to participate in and control their own programs. The heaviest activities have been in programs for community action and youth training.

The Bureau, together with other Federal agencies launched selected Indian reservation programs to step-up the pace on the economic development process on 39 Indian reservations and waged a concentrated effort to stimulate economic and social change for Indians.

In 1966, the Indian people were in the forefront of public attention. That year, Robert L. Bennett, an Oneida Indian, was appointed Commissioner for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The people-oriented approach was apparent in the stated policy of Commissioner Bennett. He espoused greater Indian involvement in decision-making and program execution. A new era of Federal Indian relations was emerging with the Bureau taking the form of a coordinating and advisory agency, rather than the sole primary agency concerned with development of the human and economic resources of Indian communities.

Early in 1967, a 16 member National Indian Education Advisory Committee was appointed to assist in school programming and to improve communications between the schools and the Indian people they service. The Committee has devised a set of guidelines for the orderly transfer for Bureau schools to local Indian boards of education. Major financial support will continue to come from the Bureau under contracts with the Indian tribes. Indians are now participating in planning for the education of their own children, both on many public school boards and for Bureau schools.

For the first time, in the fall of 1967, 34 kindergartens were opened for Indian children under the auspices of the Bureau. These were the first to be funded by the Bureau and complements the Head Start program of OEO. To reach those adult Indians who for various reasons had little or no education and training, the Bureau began a breakthrough effort in employment assistance with the establishment of "whole family" residential training centers, which attempts to fit the entire family to urban life.

A historic special message on goals and programs of the American Indians was sent to the Congress by President Johnson in March of 1968 which proposed "a new goal--a goal that ends the old debate about termination of Indian programs and stresses self-determination, a goal that erases old attitudes of paternalism and promotes partnership and self-help." The message continued:

"Our goal must be: A standard of living for Indians equal to that of the country as a whole, freedom of choice--an opportunity to remain in their homeland, if they choose, without surrendering their dignity, and an opportunity to move to the towns and cities of America if they choose, equipped with skills to live in equality and dignity; full participation in the life of modern America, with a full share of economic opportunity and social justice."

Indian involvement in decision-making was made an integral part of policy planning by the issuance of an Executive Order which established a National Council on Indian Opportunity to review Federal programs for the American Indians, make broad policy recommendations, and to ensure that programs reflect the needs and desires of the Indian people, including those who live in urban areas. The Vice President was appointed as Chairman and council members include a cross-section of Indian leaders and high Government officials.

The President's message and the Senate pronouncement in Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 of the 90th Congress, clearly enunciated for the first time since 1953, a declaration of purpose toward the American Indians and the Alaska Natives. These pronouncements also took affirmative action to reverse the unilateral termination policies since House Concurrent Resolution 108 of 1953.

President Nixon Reaffirms Special Relationship

During the 1968 Presidential campaigning, President-elect Richard M. Nixon presented to the American public some of the guidelines for the Federal Indian policy his administration would pursue. He reaffirmed the special relationship between the Federal Government and the Indian people and emphasized that termination would not be a policy objective.

Mr. Nixon also stated that the right of self-determination of Indian people would be respected and their participation in planning their own destinies would be actively encouraged. "We must recognize that American society can allow many different cultures to flourish in harmony and we must provide an opportunity for those Indians wishing to do so to lead a useful and prosperous life in an Indian environment." The right of Indian people to direct the affairs of their communities has become the keynote for policy decision-making in the Nixon administration.

In August 1969 President Nixon appointed Louis R. Bruce, an Indian of Sioux-Mohawk descent, the new Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Mr. Bruce is the third Indian to be appointed Commissioner since the Bureau of Indian Affairs was established in 1824. With the approval of the President, Commissioner Bruce subsequently announced a realignment of the top management positions at the BIA central office and appointed a new executive staff, composed of 14 Indians, one Alaska Native, and four non-Indians. More Indians than ever before in Bureau history now hold management positions.

President Nixon's special Message to the Congress on July 8, 1970 regarding Indian affairs established future Federal Indian policy. Along with more specific proposals for legislation, the message affirmed the historic relationship between the Federal Government and Indian communities, guaranteed that it would not be abridged without Indian consent, and proposed that Indian communities be allowed to take over control and operation of Federally-funded Indian programs when they chose to do so. The President added, "It is long past the time that the Indian policies of the Federal Government began to recognize and build upon the capacities and insights of the Indian people...the time has come to break decisively with the past and to create the conditions for a new era in which the Indian future is determined by Indian acts and Indian decisions."

In his message, President Nixon called for self-determination for Indian people without the threat of termination of the trust relationship over Indian lands and the services guaranteed to Indian people along with this relationship. While President Nixon's message is the second delivered by the President of the United States, it is the first to be implemented by legislation. Among his recommendations, the President asked for:

- A new Concurrent Resolution that would "renounce, repudiate and repeal" the termination policy outlined in HCR 108 of the 83rd Congress.
- Support for voluntary Indian control of Indian programs with the necessary technical assistance from the Government to facilitate transfers of responsibilities;
- restoration of the sacred lands near Blue Lake to the Indians of Taos Pueblo;

- support for Indian communities to take over Indian schools, to establish Indian school boards, to receive funds and to contract for the operation of schools;
- economic development legislation through the "Indian Financing Act of 1970" to enable Indian leaders to arrange for the development and use of natural resources;
- improved government efforts to deliver services needed to assist Indians living in urban centers;
- establishment of an Indian Trust Counsel Authority "to assure independent legal representation for the Indians natural resource rights" and to avoid conflicts of interest within government agencies;
- the creation of a new office within the Department of the Interior--Assistant Secretary for Indian and Territorial Affairs.

The first of the President's recommendations to become law was the act restoring Blue Lake and the 48,000 acres of surrounding land to the Taos Pueblo Indians of New Mexico. This act is significant because it returns lands to an Indian tribe that had been taken and used for other purposes. Former practice had been to make cash settlements alone in compensation for land taken.

In keeping with the President's recommendations and proposals for legislation, Commissioner Bruce and his Indian executive team began working to restructure the BIA at all levels so that its policies and programs would reflect the thinking and feelings of the majority of Indian people. Five policy goals were announced in November 1970 to guide the Bureau in its new administration of Indian affairs;
- transformation of BIA from a management to a service organization;
- reaffirmation of the trust status of Indian land;
- making the BIA Area Offices fully responsive to the Indian people they serve;
- providing tribes with the option of taking over any or all BIA program functions with the understanding that Bureau will provide assistance or resume control if requested to do so;
- working with Indian organizations to become a strong advocate of urban Indian interests.

The idea of self-determination--the right of Indian to make their own choices and decisions--is becoming a reality as Indian people begin to assume the authority to manage their own affairs. Since the announcement of the new BIA goals, tribes have chosen to undertake increasing responsibility for service programs previously administered by Federal agencies.

BIA Service and Support Agency

In its new role as a service and support rather than a management organization, the BIA is encouraging and assisting tribes in their assumption of program operations.

The Zuni Tribe of New Mexico assumed the responsibility for directing BIA activities at the pueblo in May 1970. Almost a year later, the BIA signed a contract with the Miccousukee Tribe of Florida empowering them to administer BIA programs on the reservation, including all education and social operations. BIA field technicians and administrators are working directly with these two Indian groups to assist with the development and implementation of programs to meet the expressed and particular needs of the two Native American communities.

The recent emergence of a strong and positive attitude on the part of Indian people that they can and will have better lives has become historically important. Indians of all ages, representing all tribes undertaking unprecedented efforts to overcome the problems confronting them.

Evidence of this new attitude is apparent in the establishment of the National Tribal Chairmen's Association (NTCA), a new organization of elected tribal chairmen. Created in April 1971, NTCA set up a 15-member commission to advise the BIA on national Indian policy. Through this group, reservation Indians can present a single, united voice in shaping the future of Indian affairs.

NTCA is not the only voice being heard at the decision-making levels in Indian affairs. As the urban Indian population has gained in numbers, other Indian organizations such as the National Congress of American Indians and the American Indian Movement have been instrumental in bringing recognition to the Indians in off-reservation communities.

Since World War II, when thousands of Indians left the reservations for military service or for war time jobs, a steady off reservation movement has been taking place. This was given an additional boost in the early 1950's with the initiation of the BIA Employment Assistance Program which assisted Indians in locating permanent employment in non-reservation areas. The urban Indian movement of the 1950's and 1960's has resulted in an estimated 350,000 Indians living off the reservations today.

In his message to the Congress on national Indian policy, President Nixon pointed out that although the "BIA's responsibility does not extend to Indians who have left the reservation", this fact is "not always clearly understood. As a result of this misconception, Indians living in urban areas have often lost out on the opportunity to participate in other programs designed for disadvantaged groups." President Nixon directed the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) to lead efforts to help urban Indian leaders work toward solutions to their problems.

OEO announced in May 1971 that it had joined with the Departments of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and Labor to create a Model Urban Indian Center Program to provide special assistance to the growing urban Indian population. Federal grants totaling some $880,000 will be used to upgrade Indian centers in Los Angeles, Minneapolis, Gallup, and Fairbanks, and to establish a central research technical assistance and coordinating office in New York City.

As a result of experience gained in various tribal, State and Federal programs there is presently a trained and educated Indian leadership available to staff management positions at levels where decisions are made regarding Indian affairs. Indian leaders are working in government agencies having programs that serve Indians both on and off the reservation. The Indian desk concept, after experimentation and successful operation in OEO, has been extended to the Departments of Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, Justice, HUD, and HEW.

In February 1971 an Indian was appointed Consultant on Indian Affairs to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In March an Indian woman was appointed Special Assistant for Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior. Over 50 percent of the BIA employees are Indian although a much smaller though steadily increasing percentage are employed in management level positions. Eight of the 16 members of the National Council on Indian Opportunity are Indians. Other Indians are taking leadership in the establishment of such projects as Deganawidah-Quetzalcoatl University for Indians and Mexican Americans near Davis, California.

An Indian future determined by Indian acts and Indian decisions, President Nixon states as a goal in his historic July message. In the last few years the Federal Government has come to recognize that Indians can and should supply the leadership for their people. Maximum Indian involvement and commitment will help to achieve the goals of present Indian policy.

Commissioner Bruce welcomed 1972 by announcing plans for a massive re-direction of the BIA's programs for the future. In a press conference on January 12, 1972, Commissioner Bruce and Assistant Secretary of the Interior Harrison Loesch unveiled a five-point program entitled "A Way to Go in 72". The new program designed to assist Indians toward self-determination plans for reservation by reservation development, re-direction of the BIA employment assistance program, resources protection, reservation roads improvements, and increasing tribal control over Indian education.

The five-point program includes a reversal of a 15 year-old policy of training Indians to work in urban areas off the reservations. Instead, the new plan proposes that the $40 million employment assistance program be centered on the reservation for the development of a local labor force. The primary objective of the new strategy is to start the development of a total viable Indian economy on the reservations. "Developing Indian economics does not mean really locating non-Indian industry close to or on the reservations so that these corporations can enjoy a cheap labor supply. It means the development of truly Indian economic systems so that a dollar once earned by an Indian citizen can be spent and kept moving throughout an Indian economy, thus developing that economy and making a maximum impact upon that community......I want to see Indian economies where dollars move from Indian hand to Indian hand and are not drained out by those non-Indian cities that develop and grow and feed upon Indian reservations," states Commissioner Bruce.

Each of the five policy points is directly related to the goal of self-determination. In the reservation by reservation development program, each tribe formulates its own comprehensive economic development plans. A new Indian Water Rights Office is designed to protect Indian water and land rights from encroachments by Federal and private interests. Increased number and quality of roads on the reservations is essential to optimum economic, social and educational development. The present $30 million allocated for road construction will be doubled in the next fiscal year, according to Secretary Loesch. The final point is aimed at making Indian education truly reponsive to the needs of Indian children and parents.

A new tool for increasing skilled manpower and managerial know-how was establihed on Reservations in FY 1971. The Indian Action Team Program includes classroom work, shop application, and on-the-job experience that enables blue-collar workers to progress toward a journey man level.

Portions of this article were taken from the Department of Interior publication.

Administrators of U.S. Federal Indian Policy

Henry Knox*	1789	George Washington
Thomas Pickering	1795	George Washington
James McHenry	1796	George Washington and John Adams
Samuel Dexter	1800	John Adams
Henry Dearborn	1801	Thomas Jefferson
William Eustis	1809	James Madison
John Armstrong	1813	James Madison
James Monroe	1814	James Madison
William H. Crawford	1815	James Madison and James Monroe
John C. Calhoun**	1817	James Monroe
James Barbour**	1825	John Quincy Adams
Peter B. Porter**	1828	John Quincy Adams
John H. Eaton**	1829	Andrew Jackson
Lewis Cass**	1831	Andrew Jackson

*Knox had served as "Secretary in the War Office" since 1784. Prior to that, from 1775 on, Indian affairs had been carried on by Indian Commissioners from three departments, responsible to the Continental Congress.

**On March 11, 1824, Calhoun named Thomas L. McKenney, who had served from 1816-22 as Superintendent of Indian Trade under the War Department, to be the "head" of the Bureau of Indian Affairs within the War Department. McKenney served in this capacity under Secretaries Calhoun, Barbour, Porter, and Eaton, until replaced by Samuel S. Hamilton on September 30, 1830. Hamilton, in turn, was succeeded by Elbert Herring in 1831, who a year later became the first Commissioner of Indian Affairs by an Act of Congress.

Commissioners of Indian Affairs

1832 to Present

	Year of Appointment	President
Elbert Herring	1832	Andrew Jackson
Carey A. Harris	1836	Andrew Jackson and Martin Van Buren
T. Hartley Crawford	1838	Martin Van Buren, William H. Harrison, and John Tyler
William Medill	1845	James K. Polk and Zachary Taylor
Orlando Brown	1849	Zachary Taylor and Millard Fillmore
Luke Lea	1850	Millard Fillmore
George Manypenny	1853	Franklin Pierce
James W. Denver	1857	James Buchanan
Charles E. Mix	1858	James Buchanan
James W. Denver	1858	James Buchanan
Alfred B. Greenwood	1859	James Buchanan
William P. Dole	1861	Abraham Lincoln and Andrew Johnson
Dennis Cooley	1865	Andrew Johnson
Lewis V. Bogy	1866	Andrew Johnson
Nathaniel G. Taylor	1867	Andrew Johnson
Eli S. Parker	1869	Ulysses S. Grant
Francis A. Walker	1871	Ulysses S. Grant
Edward P. Smith	1873	Ulysses S. Grant
John O. Smith	1875	Ulysses S. Grant and R. B. Hayes
Ezra A. Hayt	1877	Rutherford B. Hayes
R. E. Trowbridge	1880	Rutherford B. Hayes

	Year of Appointment	President
Hiram Price	1881	James Garfield and Chester A. Arthur
John D. C. Atkins	1885	Grover Cleveland
John H. Oberly	1888	Grover Cleveland
Thomas J. Morgan	1889	Benjamin Harrison
Daniel M. Browning	1893	Grover Cleveland
William A. Jones	1897	William McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt
Francis E. Leupp	1904	Theodore Roosevelt
Robert G. Valentine	1909	William Howard Taft
Cato Sells	1913	Woodrow Wilson
Charles H. Burke	1921	Warren G. Harding and Calvin Coolidge
Charles J. Rhoads	1929	Herbert Hoover
John Collier	1933	Franklin D. Roosevelt
William A. Brophy	1945	Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman
John R. Nichols	1949	Harry S. Truman
Dillon S. Myer	1950	Harry S. Truman
Glenn L. Emmons	1953	Dwight D. Eisenhower
Philleo Nash	1961	John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson
Robert L. Bennett	1966	Lyndon B. Johnson
Louis R. Bruce	1969	Richard M. Nixon

Important Dates in Federal Indian Relationships

1633	First land allotment policy established (by General Court of Massachusetts Colony, acting to provide land allotments among Indians).
1754	English colonies met at Albany Congress to discuss unified colonial Indian policy.
1763	King George III proclamation setting aside "reserved lands" for Indians.
1764	Plan for Imperial Department of Indian Affairs.
1775	Continental Congress named Indian commissioners in north, middle, and southern departments.
1775	First negotiation between Indian commissioners and Indian groups (Six Nations).
1778	First Indian treaty signed (with Delaware, September 17).
1784	Congress assigns War Office to provide militia in assisting Indian commissioners negotiating Indian treaties.
1789	Congress gives Indian authority to War Department; later it passes first appropriations for Indian affairs and designates territorial governors as ex-officio Indian superintendents under War Department.
1794	First Indian treaty providing education for Indians (Oneidas, Tuscaroras and Stockbridges).
1796	Establishment by law of Indian trading houses, operated by government.
1803	Louisiana Purchase from France, vast lands inhabited by Indians.
1806	Creation in War Department of an Office of Superintendent of Indian Trade, to administer Federal Indian trading houses.
1815-25	Post-war treaties with tribes north of Ohio River resolving trading areas and beginning removal to new western lands.
1817-18	First Seminole War in Florida.
1819	Congress enacts "civilization fund"--first Federal Indian education program.
1819	Final Florida boundaries resolved with England; Indian lands involved.
1822	Act abolishing Indian trading houses and Office of Indian Trade, also naming new Office of Superintendent of Indian Affairs at St. Louis for western lands.
1827	Adoption of Cherokee Constitution; Georgia legislature nullifies it.
1829	Cass-Clark Report in regularizing Federal Indian administration.
1830	Passage by Congress of Indian Removal Act.
1832-42	Federal Government conducts removal of "Five Civilized Tribes" from southeast States to new western territories.
1834	Acts creating an Office of Indian Affairs, coordinating Federal Indian administration, and modernizing Indian trade administration.
1845	Entry into Union on Republic of Texas.
1845-48	Mexican War.
1849	Act transferring Bureau of Indian Affairs from War Department to new Department of the Interior.
1853	Gadsden Purchase, acquiring new Indian lands from Mexico.
1867-68	Indian Peace Commission negotiates final treaties with Indians (last of 370 Indian treaties on August 13, 1868 with Nez Perce).
1869	Act creating Board of Indian Commissioners (lasting until 1933).
1870-86	Federal Indian policy, backed by military support, places final Indians on reservations; practice of giving Indians food and clothing rations started.
1871	Act abolishing all Indian treaty-making.
1887	Dawes Severalty Act, establishing official land allotment policy.
1902-10	Start of Federal Indian reclamation, forestry, conservation programs.
1906	Burke Act, amending Dawes Act on allotment, describing Indian "competency."
1924	Act giving Indians citizenship and right to vote.
1924	Indian Health Division established within Indian Bureau.

1928	Meriam Report published (after 2-year study), emphasizing new Indian reforms.
1934	New Indian legislation, including Indian Reorganization Act (IRA), ending allotment policy, providing for tribal self-government, launching Indian credit program; and Johnson-O'Malley Act, spreading out Federal Indian administration to many agencies.
1935	Act setting up Indian Arts and Crafts Board (established in 1936).
1948	Hoover Commission recommends transfer of Indian Bureau to Federal Security Agency.
1953	House Concurrent Resolution 108 calling for termination of Federal trusteeship over the affairs and property of Indian tribes and groups.
1954	First of several acts calling for termination of Federal trust status over Indian lands (Menominees of Wisconsin).
1954	Act transferring Indian Health Division from Indian Bureau of Public Health Service (transfer made in 1955).
1961	Interior Secretary Udall names Task Force on Indian Affairs, reporting later in year with long-range recommendations.
1961	Federal housing assistance programs opened up to Indian reservations.
1962	Interior Secretary Udall names Task Force on Alaskan Indian Affairs, reporting later in year.
1964	Economic Opportunity Act programs provide Indians opportunity to participate in and control their own programs.
1966	Appointment of Robert L. Bennett, an Oneida Indian, as Commissioner of Indian Affairs.
1968	President Johnson's special message dealing exclusively with American Indians and Alaskan Natives, a historic first.
1968	By an Executive Order, National Council on Indian Opportunity, under Chairmanship of the Vice President, established. Indian involvement in decision-making made an integral part of policy planning.
1969	Appointment of Louis R. Bruce, a Sioux-Mohawk Indian of New York, as Commissioner of Indian Affairs.
1970	President Nixon's special message dealing exclusively with American Indians and Alaskan Natives sets forth a legislative program and expresses the idea of self-determination without the threat of termination.
1970	Forty-eight thousand acres of land including Blue Lake returned to the Taos Pueblo, the first time a sizeable piece of land has been restored to an Indian group.
1972	The Employment Assistance or relocation program redirected to enable Indians to be trained for work on reservations.

Federal Indian Policy and Labor Statistics—a review essay

Commission's report to the Congress objects to the lack of uniform definitions of Indians and Indian unemployment, and recommends new procedures for the 1980 census

Mary Ellen Ayres

Because issues concerning the American Indian are so old and still unresolved, and because the Indian heritage is woven deeply into the fabric of American life, social scientists are likely to be interested in the final report of the American Indian Policy Review Commission, submitted to the Congress last year. The Commission was the first top-level investigative commission in Indian affairs since the Institute for Government Research, which produced the Meriam Report in 1928. The Commission was formed in 1973, following 3 years of protest activity by American Indians. Three demonstrations in particular--the occupation of Alcatraz Island, the Trail of Broken Treaties protest in Washington, D.C., and the demonstration at Wounded Knee--captured national and international headlines.

A joint congressional resolution gave the American Indian Policy Review Commission a mandate "to conduct a comprehensive review of the historical and legal relationships underlying the Indians' unique ties with the Federal Government in order to determine the nature and scope of necessary revisions in the formulation of policies and programs for the benefit of Indians." The legislation acknowledges that Federal Indian policy has "shifted and changed" throughout the 20th century, "without apparent rational design and without a consistent goal to achieve Indian self-determination."

The Commission was made up of five American Indians, representing a spectrum of Indian communities and conditions, and seven Senators and Congressmen--the majority representing States with large Indian populations.[52] The Commission submitted its report to the Congress on May 17, 1977, and disbanded. Where legislation is required to bring about the recommendations of the Commission, the matter will be referred to appropriate committees of the Congress, where definitive reports are required within 2 years.

The final report makes 206 specific recommendations, ranging over a number of issues. The Commission mentions in its report a significant problem which could hamper the implementation of its recommendations: the lack of comprehensive, accurate statistical data on Indians.

When an American Indian tribe was placed on an Indian reservation about 50 to 100 years after the first Europeans landed in what is now the United States, the name of each member was probably put down on a roll which very likely exists to this day--a bit yellowed--in the National Archives and Records Service. Some of the names on these lists are Indian names: Isminat makpahs, Bah ooh [illegible]y ichis, Ah key chis. Some reflect the merging--even then--of the European and aboriginal worlds: Bull Over the Hill, Yellow Coyote, Antelope Trail. Others are indistinguishable from those found today in the American mainstream: Virginia Pearson, Paul Hill, Effie N. Davis. From this highly personal census, with social implications that continue to this day, stems one case for a special relationship between the U.S. Government and the American Indians.

Today, some of the Indians on tribal rolls no longer live on reservations. Some Indians solved their problems with the newcomers to the continent at any early date, without being placed on reservations. Their names do not appear on tribal rolls. This situation contributes to the gaps and inaccuracies of statistical data on Indians--statistics that could be the basis for charting conditions planning programs, and measuring progress in Indian affairs. But the basic reason for the questionable statistics, the Commission argues, is that no clear cut, generally accepted definition of an "Indian" exists.

Data Deficiencies

The Federal Government, State governments, and the Census Bureau all have different criteria for identifying a person as an "Indian." Federal criteria are inconsistent from one agency to another. For example, a State that wishes Federal financial help for the education of Indians receives it only for the people in its program who can prove at least one-quarter Indian blood. To receive preference in hiring as an Indian, enrollment records from a federally recognized tribe have been required. Under regulations on law and order, anyone merely "of Indian descent" is considered an Indian. State criteria for deciding who is or is not an Indian are even less consistent. When several States with large Indian populations were asked about their guidelines, two accepted self-declaration, four counted individuals as Indian if they were "recognized in the community" as such, five used residence on an Indian reservation as a criterion, and one required at least one-quarter Indian blood.

The result of this is data that lack comparability and cannot be combined.

The difficulty of Indian data collection is compounded by the fragmented jurisdiction over Indians. Health services, agricultural and other developmental assistance, business loans, housing aid, land development, and other programs--although all directed to Indians--are handled by different government agencies. Thus, statistics that would reflect the Indian condition are scattered. There is, at present, no central clearinghouse for the data.

Despite the imperfections of Indian statistical information the report of the American Indian Policy Review Commission has collected a wealth of data. The social statistics by the Commission and cited in this article come primarily from the 1970 census. The concept of race used by the Bureau of the Census does not denote any scientific definition of the biological stock, but rather indicates what race a person identifies with. For persons of mixed parentage who are unsure of their classification, the race of the person's father is used.

Residence

Of all of the States, Vermont has the smallest Indian population (229), although more than 25 percent of all Indians (792,730) live in the Northeast and, contrary to popular belief, more than half live outside the Western States. North Carolina, for example, has the fifth largest Indian population (44,406) in the country.

Only 28 percent of all U.S. Indians live on land reserved to the Indians--reservations. These reservations range in size from the 15.4 million acre Navajo reservation in the Southwest with approximately 125,000 tribal members, to the one-quarter acre Golden Hill Reservation in Connecticut with six citizens. A total of 289 tribes and bands live on 268 "federally recognized" reservations or otherwise defined "trust areas" in 26 States. Nine "State-recognized" reservations or otherwise defined "trust areas" in 26 States. Nine "State-recognized" reservations in New York and one in Texas receive some Federal assistance. Two additional tribes are recognized in a limited fashion. There are also 24 State Indian reservations, 219 Native Alaskan villages or reservations, and even some urban reservations such as Aqua Caliente in Palm Springs, Calif. Federal reservation land is generally held in trust for a particular tribe and there is no general law that will permit the tribe to sell such land. Reservation land is usually free from real property taxes and the income from this land is also generally exempted from taxation.

However, State and Federal reservation statistics do not begin to tell the whole American Indian story. An estimated 32,000 Indians exist without either Federal or State recognition. Some belong to tribes that were never recognized by the Federal Government, others to tribes whose Federal status was "terminated" by legislation during the 1950's and early 1960's. These tribes or communities are scattered across the United States and include the Mohegan Community in Connecticut, the Montauk Community on Long Island, the Narragansett Community in Rhode Island, the Houma Community of Louisiana, the Yacqui Indians of Arizona, and others.

The largest percentage of American Indians live neither on reservations nor in communities, but in cities. More than 46 percent of all Indians (335,738) were urban residents in 1970, double the number in 1960. These Indians may belong to a State or federally recognized tribe, a community without its own reservation or land, or a "terminated" tribe. The largest number of urban Indians (23,908) live in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area, followed by Tulsa, Okla. (15,983), Oklahoma City (12,981), San Francisco-Oakland (12,041), and Phoenix (10,127). The Census Bureau lists 30 Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas with large Indian populations.

Income & Health

The Commission's report states: "From the standpoint of personal well-being, the Indian of America ranks at the bottom of virtually every social statistical indicator. On the average, he has the highest infant mortality rate, the lowest longevity rate, the lowest level of educational attainment, the lowest per capita income, and the poorest housing and transportation in the land."

As noted, Indian incomes are lower than those of the U.S. population, with 34 percent of all Indians having an annual income of $4,000 or less, compared with 15 percent of the total population. Only 22 percent of all Indians earn $10,000 or more, compared with 47 percent of the U.S. population. Statistics on health care, in general, do not lag as badly as those for income. Since the Indian Health Service began in 1955, mortality rates have declined and life expectancy has increased. Between 1955 and 1971, for example, the Indian infant death rate decreased by 56 percent and the maternal death rate by 54 percent. Deaths from tuberculosis, gastritis, and influenza pneumonia declined 86, 88, and 57 percent, respectively.

But health care remains a serious concern of Indians. Although life expectancy increased from 60 years in 1950 to 65.1 years in

1970, it remains the lowest of any population group. The Indian death rate from accidents was three times the national average in 1971, as were the Indian mortality rates for cirrhosis of the liver, tuberculosis, and gastritis. Although death rates have decreased, the incidence of certain diseases (such as strep throat, scarlet fever, and influenza) has increased substantially.

The Indian Health Service serves those Indians enrolled in a federally recognized tribe--the same group served by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Generally, these Indians live on or near a reservation. Although the Commission's report does not make the point, presumably these health and life expectancy figures apply to this group of American Indians. However, the census data (used more generally throughout the report) include both Indians on the reservation and those in the general population. Since the health problems of Indians on reservations are believed to be greater than those of urban Indians citing reservation figures in the report without explanation may illustrate the danger of generalizing from data based on one definition of an Indian.

Education & Employment

Educational levels of Indians compare poorly with the larger population, and this weighs against Indians when they seek work, the Commission's report indicates. Of all the men in the United States, 74 percent are employed, but only 56 percent of all Indian men are working (table 1). Although Indian women are not as often unemployed as Indian men, they are often underemployed--earning $4,000 a year or less. In addition, they are less likely to earn the $10,000 a year that is at least a beginning toward a living wage, according to the Commission.

Poverty is more severe among Indians who live in rural areas than among city dwellers. This includes impoverishment in terms of housing, sanitation, and transportation. Rural Indian women face the greatest difficulties, because they rank below all urban women and rural and urban men in education, income,

Education & Employment of Indians 1970

Characteristic	Indian men	All men	Indian women	All women
Education:				
Completed grade school	63.0	73.0	66.0	75.0
Completed high school	34.0	54.0	35.0	55.0
Completed college	3.5	12.6	2.5	7.8
Median number of years	10.5	12.1	10.5	12.1
Employment				
Unemployed	11.6	3.9	10.2	5.1
Employed	56.0	74.0	31.0	39.0
Income $4,000 per year or less	55.0	31.0	80.0	68.0
Income $10,000 per year or more	8.5	25.2	1.5	3.2
Median income	$3,509	$6,614	$1,697	$2,404

and employment. Sixty-eight percent of rural Indians have incomes of $4,000 a year or less and only 4.3 percent have annual incomes of $10,000 or more.

The unemployment rates cited in the table of 11.6 percent for Indian men and 10.2 percent for Indian women (based upon Bureau of the Census data) do not satisfy the Commission, because only those persons who have actively sought employment are included. The Commission contends that since a reservation generally affords few jobs, many persons do not actively seek what does not exist, and therefore do not show up in the unemployment figures.

Because statistics on American Indians are not always accurate or up-to-date, the true extent of Indian unemployment and poverty is not known, according to the Commission's report. In addition, it is impossible to establish clearly, at this time, whether programs directed toward improving the lives of American Indians are having significant success.

Unemployment & Training

The Commission contends that the size of the Indian labor pool on reservations is unknown. Bureau of Indian Affairs unemployment statistics, it charges, are "based on, at best, arbitrary criteria; at worst, impressionistic judgments by local agency personnel...The agency does not take a household survey to establish these figures but merely adjusts the previous year's figures to reflect any changes it thinks may have occurred." However, despite the problems with the Indian income and unemployment statistics from the Census Bureau and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, they are used by the Department of Labor to determine Indian fund allocation under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act.

A major difficulty with the available data is that the two agencies use different definitions of unemployment. The Census Bureau defines an unemployed person as one who has been seeking work within the 4 weeks preceding the interview, while the Bureau of Indian Affairs also includes persons who are not seeking work but are employable. As a result, the Bureau of Indian Affairs figures show a larger labor force and higher rates of unemployment. They justify their definition by the nature of job search on the reservation, where there is almost perfect job information.

The Commission suspects that the census figures are underestimates, the Bureau of Indian Affairs figures overestimates, and the truth somewhere in between. They suggest, "possibly for the 1980 census the question should be modified for the American Indians. They should be asked, "When job opportunities occur, do you seek them?" The differences over unemployment figures may be addressed by the nine-member National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics created by the Congress to study the Government's system of collecting job data.

American Indian reservations are a dependency environment today, the Commission charges, implying that this status contributes to the low income and poor health of Indians. As an example of dependency, the Commission cites a General Accounting Office report that notes that although the gross reservation product of one tribe had increased by 89 percent from $20.3 million in 1968 to $38.5 million in 1972, the bulk of the increase was in Government expenditures. However, the percentage of Federal funds allocated to welfare and unemployment payments had decreased. Says the Commission, "These figures are encouraging. If additional opportunities for training and education in the economies such as business management and natural resources (development) were available, Indian tribes would have an increased capacity for developing a self-sufficient economy."

Education and training should be intermeshed with reservation development, says the Commission. This includes developing skilled workers in many areas, including technical experts, administrators, and managers. Counseling that will support this goal is also necessary. A difficulty with the present training programs is that most of them have involved blue-collar occupations. The inadequacies of secondary education on the reservation have probably been a major force pushing young Indians toward trade schools. The few professional training programs have focused on teaching, the social sciences, and, to a lesser extent, law and health; the hard sciences, such as engineering, business, and administration, have been neglected.

However, the Commission's report points out that the greatest barrier to increased employment on reservations is simply lack of jobs, "...it is unfair to criticize these (training) programs if Indian communities do not have an inventory of what skills are most needed. In addition, it is futile to train workers when there is no possibility of obtaining employment."

The Commission recommends that the Bureau of Labor Statistics collect accurate, uniform, and consistent statistics each year on the Indian labor force on every Federal and State reservation, as well as data on what jobs are available on each reservation by type of economic activity, and which jobs are held by Indians. The Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Department of Labor are currently required to keep accurate and detailed statistics on every participant in federally funded employment and training programs. The Commission suggests that the participants' subsequent job status be monitored for at least 5 years. The Commission further suggests that these programs be coordinated with the tribal development programs and the Economic Development Administration, which will specify the labor requirements for their projects. The Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Department of Labor should institute the necessary training for the projects well in advance.

The final report instructs the Office of Management and Budget to insure that (1) an approach is developed to coordinate Federal efforts at the reservation level, (2) continuous evaluations are made of the effect that Federal programs have on the standard of living on reservations and information systems are developed to support such evaluations, and (3) annual reports are submitted to the Congress on progress made in improving the standard of living of reservation Indians and on any legislative changes necessary to improve the effectiveness of Federal programs.

The 1980 Census

One of the task force reports (number 10) contains specific recommendations concerning the Bureau of the Census count of American Indians. The Census count is of far-reaching importance to statisticians and to social scientists. For example, statistics on labor force, employment, and unemployment are derived from census data. The task force report indicates that, for the purposes of a successful and complete enumeration of American Indians during the 1980 census, Congress should direct all Federal departments and agencies to utilize this definition: "American Indian or Indian" means any individual who is a member, or a descendant of a member, of a North American tribe, band, or otherwise organized group of Native people who are indigenous to the continental United States or who otherwise have a special relationship with the United States or a State, through treaty, agreement, executive order, or statute.

According to the report, the term "race" should be replaced with "ethnic group" and the use of the term "mixed Indian" in census questionnaires, tabulations, and reports, should be abandoned.

The Bureau of the Census should make tabulations--both routine and special--of "American Indian communities" as defined by the populationclustering of American Indians within geographic boundaries of Federal and State reservations, federally restricted or tribally owned lands, and within urban and rural areas.

Suggestions to the Census Bureau for planning and executing the 1980 census include using local Indian people, whenever possible, for advance public relations and related information and data collection, cooperating with local community governments and organizations, revising classifications for tribes and other Indian groups, and, whenever possible, using 100 percent enumeration of selected Indian communities. The recommendation that Indians make the count of other Indians might be brought about through existing job placement programs, which could pinpoint prospective Indian census takers and even train them.

The task force also recommends that the Census Bureau consider a special 1985 census of the American Indian population involving selective tabulations and limited-purpose population surveys, to be conducted in cooperation with the various Indian communities. These efforts should be coordinated between the Indian communities and with such Federal agencies as the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. A special census would correct any significant deficiency found in the 1980 census, or any prior censuses, which hampered the successful administration of federally funded programs by Indian community governments or organizations. It would also provide full and adequate information to the Indian community governments or organizations and the Federal agencies.

Although the methods to be used in making the 1980 census are as yet unknown, special survey work for any population is expensive and time consuming. Not all the statistical work demanded by legislation is presently being done by reporting agencies because of lack of time, money, and staff. To bring about any survey, report, or statistical work beyond that already being undertaken, it seems that the Congress would have to establish the Indian data as high priority and appropriate considerable money to accomplish the results it agrees are necessary.

Evaluating the Report

Planners who deal with American Indians frequently contend that each Indian tribe is so unique that taking an overview or establishing overall guidelines in Indian affairs is almost impossible. The report of the American Indian Policy Review Commission and the task force reports refute such an argument and outline the attitudes and hopes of the Indian community as a whole. The contributing Indian authors include leaders from across the Nation who cannot be discounted as representatives of small factions. The report is a research tool of immeasurable value during the present period of misunderstanding between Indians and non-Indians on various issues in a variety of geographic locations. Overall policy towards the American Indians will continue to be developed at the Federal level, and legislators who are concerned with this as well as bureaucrats who see anthropology texts as scant help in relating to modern-day Indians will find the reports invaluable.

However, solutions to current problems will continue to begin at the local level because the history of American Indian tribes and their experiences with non-Indians vary, and because States, local governments, and the courts are often involved. Every issue that has arisen or may arise is not addressed by the Commission.

Statistical research people may feel some frustration with what they view as imprecision in statistical presentations of the final report. Although the general statement is made that most of the Indian employment and unemployment data cited are from the 1970 census, some data in the census are for Indians age 14 and 15 years, some for 16 years and over, some for all ages, and so on. The Commission's report does not make clear which figures are used. It also does not pinpoint the time period to which the material applies.

Although the point is made that statistics on American Indians can be misleading because there is no standard definition of an "Indian," the statistics in the report are cited in some instances without indicating what group of Indians are represented by them. Therefore, to use the data in the report, it may be necessary to do considerable research to isolate appropriate figures and insure that they are consistent.

Significant Recommendations

A dozen of the 206 recommendations in the final report indicate some of the major points and capture the basic intent of the Commission members:

1. That the Congress require the Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs to provide a comprehensive annual report on Indian matters, containing current and accurate data.
2. That the Congress direct all executive agencies to act in accordance with the principle: the trust responsibility to American Indians is an established legal obligation that requires the United States to protect and enhance Indian trust resources and tribal self-government and to provide economic and social programs to raise the Indians' standard of living and social well-being to the level of the rest of the American people.
3. That the long-term objective of Federal Indian policy is to develop tribal governments into fully operational governments with the same powers and responsibilities as other local governments.
4. That a Department of Indian Affairs or an independent agency be created to administer all Indian matters now taken care of by other agencies.
5. That the Congress provide funds and technical assistance for the preservation, consolidation, and acquisition of Indian lands upon which to build tribal futures.
6. That the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Department of Labor be required to coordinate their employment and training programs with tribal development programs and the Economic Development Administration, and that education be relevant to needs.
7. That the Congress enact legislation to aid tribal governments in assuming the responsibility for education.
8. That appropriate services be provided for off-reservation Indians, when feasible, through urban Indian centers.
9. That a process be set up by which terminated Indian tribes may be restored to the status of federally recognized Indian tribes.
10. That the Congress affirm its intention to recognize all Indian tribes as eligible for the benefits and protections of general Indian legislation and policy.

11. That the Congress require mandatory training in Indian history, legal status, and cultures of all government employees administering any Indian program funded in whole or in part by Federal funds.

12. That the Congress appropriate funds to assist school systems in developing educational programs in Indian affairs.

American Indians: problems & policy

American Indian Policy Review Commission, Final Report, Volume 1, 1977, 624 pp., $6.

Eleven task forces, composed almost entirely of Indians, contributed research to the final report and published their own reports, as follows:

No. 1. *Federal-Indian Relationship and Trust Responsibilities*

No. 2. *Report on Tribal Government*

No. 3. *Federal Administration and Structure of Indian Affairs*

No. 4. *Federal, State and Tribal Jurisdiction*

No. 5. *Report on Indian Education*

No. 6. *Indian Health Report*

No. 7. *Reservation and Resource Development Protection*

No. 8. *Report on Urban and Rural Non-Reservation Indians*

No. 9. Vol. 1 *Law Revision and Codification*

No. 9. Vol. 2 *Appendices to the Final Report*

No. 10. *Terminated and Non-Federally Recognized Indians*

No. 11. *Alcohol and Drug Abuse*

Two special reports published by the Commission are *Special Joint Task Force, Report on Alaskan Native Issues*, and *Special Report, Bureau of Indian Affairs Management Study*.

All of the above publications are available from the Superintendent of Documents.

Excerpt From American Indian Policy Review Commission Report

Labor Force Participation and Unemployment [53]

BREAKDOWN - MEN

Unemployment: Men

"Male Indians aged 16 and over also have an unemployment rate (11.6%) three times higher than the U.S. total rate."

"The unemployment rate for urban males (9.4%) is more than twice the national average."

"Unemployment for urban Indian men varies from 7.1% in urban Oklahoma to a high of 22.5% in urban Washington."

Labor Force Participation

"Indians have the lowest rate of male labor force participation of any group in the U.S. , Only 63% of men 16 years of age and over are in the labor force, 14% below the U.S. total average."

"the (labor force participation) rate for urban Indians has increased by 3% over the past decade while the rate for rural Indian men has increased by only 1%."

"It is likely that this lack of job opportunity adds momentum to the population shift from rural to urban areas."

"The 1970 labor force participation rate for urban Indians (72%) is approaching the national level for all men (77%)."

BREAKDOWN - WOMEN

Unemployment: Women

"At 10.2% the unemployment rate for Indian women is twice as high as for all women."

"The unemployment rates for Indian women do not differ sharply between urban and rural areas, although the rate is slightly lower in urban areas."

Labor Force Participation

"The 35% Indian female labor force participation rate is 6% lower than the national average for all women."

"The urban female labor force participation rate is 42%, 1% above the national average for women."

The figures given on the preceding page, reveal that although urban Indian unemployment rates fall significantly below those of rural Indians, unemployment rates for both far exceed national rates.

Without a doubt, concerns about Indian employment reflecting these statistics, pervade urban Indian life.

A response to a survey conducted by this task force, as well as numerous statements made by Indian persons across the country during the course of hearings placed the need for increased or improved employment above other concerns.[54]

Increased employment opportunity for Indians living in urban areas, as reflected by greater rates of labor force participation, has not curtailed high unemployment among urban Indians. Where jobs exist, Indians enter the labor force but continue to have difficulty in securing employment.

Although low levels of education are often cited among reasons for this high unemployment, a 1974 H.E.W. study states, "Despite the comparability in levels of education completed, Indians have far more unemployment compared to the total population."

The report suggests that low employment may be due more to inadequate vocational training, a result of a limited facilities in rural reservation areas where the majority of urban Indians receive their education.[55]

Rates Of Unemployment [56]

	Rural Indian	*Urban Indian*	*Total Indian*	*U.S. National*
Male	14.0%	9.4%	11.6%	3.9%
Female	10.6%	9.9%	10.2%	5.1%

NOTE: Unemployment rates among urban Indian males are 2.4 times greater than rates for the national male population.

The rate of unemployment among urban Indian females is 4.8% greater than the rate for the national female population (5.1%).

As Task Force # 8's historical review of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, (BIA) Employment Assistance Program indicates, there have been highly controversial questions raised regarding the development of policies which have resulted in the implementation of this program. Testimony and recommendations made by Indian personnel involved with employment programs outside the Bureau of Indian Affairs, specify additional problems;

1. Employment assistance skills are often not saleable.
2. Employment assistance skills are not in demand.
3. Employment assistance programs have not encouraged intensive follow-up and career development.

These problems and additional concerns which question existing BIA Employment Assistance policies that view clients in terms of outplacement statistics, begin to reveal need for different and perhaps more comprehensive employment assistance.

Upon arrival in urban communitites, Indian persons are faced with innumerable problems of adjustment. As with most individuals who move from rural communities to urban areas, problems in locating housing, meeting new friends and adjusting to the urban environment are plentiful. Unlike most individuals, however, American Indian adjustments must include increased stress on language usage (often a change from native speaking or bilingual communities); changes in cultural values, and perhaps more visibly, changes from an economically lower standard of living. That Indians move to cities primarily to seek employment, places additional inpetus on these adjustments. Unfamiliarity with employment seeking avenues and processes begin a succession of obstacles. Existing employment agencies have few counselors familiar with Indian problems. Affirmative action hiring of Indian personnel within these agencies is often minimal.

Indian persons may have difficulty completing application forms,[57] handling personal interviews and they may not be aware of their employment rights.

As noted previously, Indians lack adequate skills. With greater proportions of Indians arriving in urban areas from rural reservation communities, Indians often lack skills which limited and low level reservation employment opportunities cannot provide. Although recent tribal and federal programs have begun to institute reservation economic development and Indian preference hiring policies, rates of unemployment on reservations are still staggering.

More often than not, the rural Indian arrives upon an urban Indian scene with severely limited economic resources. His success in vying for unskilled positions in competitive labor markets is often dependent upon his work attitudes, and personal appearance.

Cultural attitudes about competition, time and ideal working relations are left to play significant roles--often to the detriment of the prospective Indian employee. (See section on non-Indian community attitudes.)

Initial lack of funds hinders the purchase of clothing appropriate for types of work (clerical, managerial, etc.) Lack of funds, furthermore, inhibits possession of adequate and reliable means of transportation; a reliable car to get to and from work, bus fares, etc. Additionally, Indians seeking employment may not have permanent addresses or telephone numbers where they may be notified about pending employment. (See section on housing.)

Many of these problems, even if overcome, result in employment at particularly low levels of employment, characterized by low pay, seasonal or unskilled labor. These factors may contribute to Indian employment stereotypes: instability, unreliability, poor attitudes, poor attendence, etc.

When such attitudes exist, non-Indian employers, particularly in the private sector, see no imperative to hiring of Indian persons.

As testimony indicates, low paying, monotonous and unskilled jobs may encourage feelings of being trapped, discouragement and generally, feelings that one had been placed in lower economic and social status by employers or society in general. Certainly, these problems can occur where Indians face discriminatory attitudes as well.

Other testimony states that such feelings may contribute to a tendency of many Indians to leave work, often without notice, to return home to attend traditional ceremonies on reservations and in Indian communities. Certainly, feelings of alienation can increase the need for socialization, particularly among other persons familiar with such problems. (See section on problems of alcoholism.)

Employment patterns of urban Indians particularly those of short-term, low paying nature, increase the need to have both adult members of families employed. This is accomplished at additional cost (for day care, transportation) and marginal benefit. In terms of family disintegration and frustration the costs may be immeasurable.

Findings

A primary reason Indians leave rural and reservation communities for urban areas, in addition to federal policies encouraging them to do so (see historical summary), is that they wish better economic opportunities, they leave primarily to seek employment.

National statistical data reveals that all Indians suffer high rates of unemployment. Testimony reveals that urban Indians have difficulties obtaining employment because:

1. They lack skills that reservation rural Indian community employment can rarely provide.

2. Vocational educational opportunities are limited, existing opportunities, BIA employment assistance training programs are not saleable.

3. They lack information on how to find jobs, where to look, what employers expect, how to be interviewed, etc.

4. They lack initial funds for the purchase of uniforms, equipment, and reliable means of transportation to and from work.

5. They are victims of discriminatory practices where overt discrimination does not exist, employers of the private sector see no imperative toward the hiring of Indian personnel.

Education

Excerpt From American Indian Policy Review Commission Report

Conflicts between Indian people and white society regarding the education of Indian children have been historically consistent. Initial attempts to educate, or "civilize" the Indian child placed extreme hardship on his parents, the community he lived in and most of all--the child. (See historical review.)

During early periods of Indian-white contact, Indian children were often forcefully taken from their families and delivered to off-reservation schools far from their homelands. There the Indian child faced a series of demoralizing experiences, his hair was cut, his traditional dress taken away, and under fear of punishment--he was prohibited from speaking his native language and practicing native religion. Among the most serious of these hardships, however, was the fact that these events occurred outside the control of the Indian parent and when the Indian child returned, he and his parent were all too often cultural strangers.

Testimony after testimony reveals that by far, the desire to have greater control over the education of his child heads the list of urban Indian educational needs.

Current statistics indicate that Indian educational achievement levels are rapidly catching up with U.S. education levels,[58] but as much of the testimony stresses this is only a part--be it a significant part of many educational objectives that must be served. The following are basic needs identified in areas of education:

Schooling completed, by Age & Sex, for U.S. Total and Urban & Rural Indians[59]

Level of Schooling Completed by Percent	Group	Percent of Total Population					
		Males			Females		
			Indians			Indians	
		U.S.	Urban	Rural	U.S.	Urban	Rural
8 Years of School or Less	16-24	11%	12%	23%	8%	11%	19%
	25-34	11	17	35	10	17	34
	35-44	19	29	52	15	26	48
	45-64	33	40	63	30	36	60
	65 +	61	69	84	55	61	81
High School Graduates	16-24	66	48	26	71	48	30
	25-34	72	58	39	71	53	36
	35-44	61	45	25	63	46	24
	45-64	46	37	19	49	38	19
	65 +	24	18	7	29	22	8
4 or More Years of College	16-24	6.5	1.9	0.1	6.1	1.4	0.4
	25-34	19.0	8.9	3.0	12.1	5.8	1.9
	35-44	17.5	7.8	2.4	8.9	5.0	1.2
	45-64	10.8	5.6	2.0	7.1	4.1	1.7
	65 +	6.3	4.1	0.6	4.9	3.7	1.1

NOTE: This table reveals that although the percentage of educational attainment levels of urban Indians are better than those of rural Indians, and that in lower levels of education they are catching up with average attainment levels of the U.S. population, the percentages of urban Indian attainment levels fall significantly behind at the high school and college level.

Need for More Parental Involvement Opportunities in Existing Educational Systems

As noted earlier, there have been historical inhibitions on Indian parent involvement in the education of their children. Testimony indicates however, that these opportunities still form a significant problem.

In urban areas, Indian people seldom find themselves in positions to favorably influence the educational policies and priorities of city-wide school boards, district school boards or state boards of education. Indians in the urban setting are a minority of minorities and have achieved little success in making their needs known.

Special programs targeted for Indian children, Johnson-O'Malley and Title IV of the Secondary Education Act of 1972, have begun to provide a wedge in allowing parental involvement, but even these fall short. Among the most common complaints are:

1. Target programs for Indian educational needs have often been mismanaged or misused.

2. Target programs, inadvertently, are beset with complicated policy and regulation.

3. Target program funding is unstable.

4. Target program goals and objectives are pre-determined by persons or groups far removed from the Indian community.

5. Target program funding is limited.

Indian parents and community leaders in urban areas have consistently urged that Indian parent committees and administrators of such target programs be given:

1. Technical assistance in understanding complicated regulations and funding processes.

2. Stable funding bases upon which they can be assured of educational continuity for the Indian children participating in the programs, and upon which coordination among other Indian groups can exist without fear of inter-group competition for limited funds.

3. More viable roles in target program policy formation.

Testimonies indicate that obtaining initial funding for target programs can be especially difficult for urban groups. They are often forced into competition with reservation groups, or must seek endorsement from unresponsive educational systems for program implementation. Application for funding has been noted to be of particular difficulty, high levels of expertise and tremendous amounts of energy must be directed toward the application process. As a consequence, fund-seeking in and of itself, becomes a priority all too often at the expense of other educational goals.

Need for more Child Care Centers

With greater proportions of Indians falling in low income categories, and increasing proportions of female heads of households,[60] it is no surprise that quality child care centers was a commonly expressed need among urban Indian communities.

Educational statistical reports indicate that although federal and local pre-school programs (Headstart and others) have involved significant numbers of rural Indian community students, such programs suffer little use by Indians in urban communities. This deficiency further defines the need for increased opportunity in this area. Pre-schools and Headstart programs when properly instrumented have provided a means to alleviate problems of language and poor educational adjustment of the minority and indigent child.

Program eligibility for such programs include children of the urban Indian poor, but urban Indians do not participate to the fullest extent. This may be a result of costly regulation, as some testimony indicates or a result of a desire for specifically Indian-oriented programs.

Nonetheless, as an H.E.W. report states, "On the basis of their high incidence of poverty and language disability the 3-4 year old urban Indians qualify for programs such as Headstart, yet only 11% are enrolled in any program."[61]

Administrators of existing child care programs urged that in addition to the need for more adequate funding support, day care centers might well be able to meet current needs were it possible for them to share facilities with existing Bureau of Indian Affairs programs. Particular facility needs include: transportation vehicles and space.

Furthermore, child care program administrators urged that Indian children be given access to Indian Health Service facilities and services for regular dental checks, and physical examinations. The initiation of such good health measures, they stated, would no doubt assure the development of good health maintenance for the child's family as well.

Enrollment in School for Pre-School Aged Indians[62]

Population Group	*Age 3-4*
U.S. Total	13%
Indian Total	14%
Urban Total	11%
Rural Total	15%

NOTE: This table reveals that attendance in pre-school age level educational programs falls below that of U.S. average and notably below rural Indian average.

Among special day care needs for Indian children reported were:

a. Additional audio-visual equipment

b. speech therapy, and special education programs,

c. psychological services.

Among special day care program needs reports were:

a. Increased parental involvement

b. employment of Indian staff, and their subsequent upgrading via formal/informal education programs in, child development, family living, day care administration, child health, etc.

It is important to note that the extent of parental involvement in day care programs in active communities have been two-fold:

1. Child service. Involves extensive communication between the child's parents, his instructors, and administrative personnel of the center regarding the need of the individual child--his educational, healthful and emotional growth.

2. Day Care Administration and Policy Formation. Includes parental involvement in some of the day-to-day administrative concerns. Includes community education activities to involve the Indian parent in a unified community advocacy for the child care center, as well as for related educational needs for his child.

Need for Indian Culture Awareness in Existing Education Systems

Indian parents note with much anguish, that in addition to the racial based harassment many of their children receive from other students in urban public schools, the children are often taught by instructors that are insensitive, poorly informed about Indian heritage and culture, and are basically incompetent to provide such services.

But instructors and fellow-student shortcomings are only a part of the problems Indian students face--as one spokesman states:

"The books within the education system still stereotype us, mock us and tell inaccurate stories of the American Indians."[63]

Parents indicated a desire for culture awareness programs for the non-Indian, as well as for their own children. Several parents noted that were there sufficient employment opportunities available on reservations, and were it possible for their families to have remained in more traditional Indian communities, the education of their children would have included traditional Indian types of education. These parents, therefore, felt that courses about Indian heritage and culture, at a minimum, should be incorporated into existing educational programming and requirements in public schools attended by Indian children.

Indian parents and administrators urged prompt affirmative action in hiring of teachers, counselors and administrative personnel. They further urged that schools assume more viable roles in seeking

87

special Indian education programs (Johnson-O'Malley; Title IV), and in assuring that fair and unbiased textbooks be utilized in the education of their children.

Among course requirements, other than cultural heritage courses, Indian parents urged that supplemental courses in Indian affairs, and reservation policy-making be made available.

Particular counseling needs include: college preparation, financial aide processes and tribal educational grant processes for high school aged students, as well as sensitive personnel and academic counseling.

Adult Education Needs

Although many Indians migrating to urban areas from rural Indian communities are recent high school graduates, there are still numerous adults in urban communities that need and desire basic adult education.

Presently, the Bureau of Indian Affairs offers programs in Adult Basic Education on reservations, but educators in urban Indian communities point out that on-reservation programs lack many basic support functions (adequate transportation to and from classes, child care, etc.) and have relatively high per-pupil costs that inhibit the full utilization and development of these programs.

Urban Indian adult education programs, conversely, though in a better position to offer more comprehensive supportive services (child care, transportation, accessibility to facilities, instructors, etc.) often find themselves ineligible for much-needed BIA funding for textbooks, teacher expenditures, etc.

Existing urban Indian adult education classes are overcrowded, and are quickly filled with individuals, often recent arrivals from reservation communities, who desire to improve basic skills in English. As many of these students later return to reservations and then return back to urban areas after periods of brief employment etc., urban Indian adult education programs find the need for coordination with similar on-reservation adult education programs essential.[64] But due to current interpretations of on-reservation program policies, this process has been dampened.

Enrollment in School for Indians by Age[65]

Population Group	*Age 3-4*	*Age 14-17*		*Age 18-24*	
		Male	*Female*	*Male*	*Female*
U.S. Total	13%	93%	92%	37%	27%
Indian Total	14	88	86	26	21
Urban Total	11	87	86	27	22
Rural Total	15	88	86	25	20

NOTE: This table reveals that "comparisons of the proportions of Indian youth currently enrolled in school in urban and rural areas present a far more positive picture of educational attainments than the college graduate data present. The data, however, also lend support to the theory that there is an exodus from rural areas by young Indians who have completed their basic education."

The rate of enrollment by Indian youth 14-17 years old is virtually the same in both urban and rural areas indicating that in both these areas young persons are remaining in school at the same rate. Yet a comparison of the years of schooling completed by young Indians living in urban and rural areas shows great disparity. If the disparity is not due to a greater dropout rate among rural Indians--and current enrollment figures suggest that they are not dropping out at a greater rate compared to urban Indians--the imbalance could be explained by the fact that those Indians living in rural areas who have completed school have left rural areas for urban locations. By doing so, the overall percentage of high school graduates among rural Indians decreases and the percentage among urban Indians increases."[66]

Consumer Education

Without a doubt, urban Indians, particularly those migrating from rural Indian communities, possess limited information about general day-to-day urban living and this limitation contributes significantly to feelings of powerlessness, etc. To some extent the need for consumer education pervades every area of concern under examination by this task force. Particular sections on Housing, Legal Aid, Employment, etc. will attempt to deal with these independently--but such treatment cannot be understated in this general area of concern.

Findings

There is an historical lack of Indian parent participation in the educational processes of Indian children.

In urban areas Indian people are seldom in a position to meaningfully influence the educational policies of existing school systems, as Indian parents form a small proportion of the urban population.

A. Parents, in addition, have urged:

1. That they be be given technical assistance to enable the development of Indian educational target programs (JOM, Title IV), and facilitate parent participation in policy formation and grant processes.
2. That additional facilities for child care be developed and that child health maintenance programs be an integral part of child care programs.
3. That cultural sensitivity and course relevancy be encouraged in existing educational systems.

B. Educational Administrators have urged:

1. That Indian adult education programs in urban and rural areas particularly those servicing bilingual persons, coordinate programs where feasible and initiate a sharing of resources.
2. That the development of policies encouraging coordinative, rather than competitive efforts between local Indian education target programs be instituted.

C. A variety of findings, as noted in this section (Education) and others, health, housing, employment, etc., indicate that there is need among urban Indians for sensitive availability of consumer education covering all aspects of urban living.

Health of The American Indian

Region VIII Task Force Report

Who Are The American Indians?

An American Indian is anyone who declares himself an Indian and is accepted as such by his peers. Throughout this paper, the term "American Indian" will be used to include American Indians, Alaska Natives, Eskimos, and Aleuts. The 1970 U.S. Census reports that there are 827,000 American Indians in the country." (NOTE: The U.S. Census for 1970 underreported the number of Indians in the United States.) However, the term "American Indian" does not refer to a genetically homogeneous group of people. These people are diverse genetically and have widely different cultures and experiences. In addition, persons recognized as Indians may have non-Indian ancestry. In 1968, one-third of all births classified as Indian had one Indian parent.[67]

Approximately one-half of American Indians are living off reservations. Information about them is sparse but their health needs must be considered if any impact is to be made upon the health of American Indians as a total group.

The other half of the Indian population, living on reservations, has maintained much of its traditional religion, social organization, language and values, and is generally described as poverty-stricken. However, it is impossible to make valid generalizations that will apply to all reservation Indians because there are well-to-do and poor, urban and rural dwellers within a single reservation. Between reservations there are differences in climate, general income, natural resources and culture.

In Region VIII, which consists of Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming, there are an estimated 98,000 Indians. They live on 23 reservations that are fully or partly located in the region, as well as in towns and cities throughout the region. In the Denver metropolitan area there are an estimated 8,000 to 10,000 Indians, a population roughly double the official 1970 Census figure of 4,348 Indians residing in the Denver Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. (See NOTE above.)

Levels of Problems Relating to Health

Good health results from a variety of factors such as sanitation (safe water and air and adequate waste disposal), adequate protection from the elements (housing and clothing), nutritionally adequate food, and an available health delivery system that protects against contagious diseases by immunization, provides for early detection and treatment of disease, provides health education to promote practices that will prevent diseases, and gives services in a culturally acceptable way.

Some American Indians have problems in securing any of the above conditions. A discussion of Indian health problems must then discuss and make recommendations about levels of problems. For example, much of the morbidity is due to poor housing and sanitation, which is due to poverty, which is due to lack of jobs, which is due to the educational system and the clash of Indian and non-Indian cultural values.

There are wide differences in the key health indices between Indians and non-Indians, and unique health problems that seem to affect Indians much more often or severely than other populations. This constitutes the first level of problems, and the health delivery system must attempt to address these deficiencies.

The second level deals with some specific health needs such as dental care, family planning and an adequate diet. The third level of consideration has to do with making the services accessible and acceptable by removing barriers of distance, culture and poverty. Finally there is the level of very basic problems of sanitation and housing.

The extensive interaction of the various factors in the various levels must also be appreciated. For instance, poor sanitation and crowding combine with poor nutrition to cause a high rate of infectious disease. Distances to services and the strangeness of their settings and methods mitigate against early care. Late care increases the likelihood of death or permanent disability, reduces the chances of quality survival and tends to assure the repetition of the cycle of poverty.

Each of these layers will be discussed in more detail later in the report.

Health Services For Indians

There are two main systems for health care delivery to Indians. The most organized and prominent of these is the Indian Health Service.

Indian Health Service

The Snyder Act, passed in 1921, provided for health services for all Indians. However, since sufficient money was never appropriated for service to all Indians, an administrative decision was made that services would be provided mainly for Indians living on or near a reservation. The legality of this decision has been questioned.

The Indian Health Service (IHS) acquired the responsibility for Indian Health from the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), Department of the Interior, in 1955. IHS has a broad range of health programs and operates hospitals, health centers, itinerant clinics and, in addition, contracts with State and community hospitals, public health departments, and private physicians and dentists for care.[68] Nearly 500,000 Indians receive care from IHS.

The charge to IHS is to plan and implement a total health program. In addition to environmental health services, acute and chronic diagnostic and treatment services and health education activities, there are a range of other specific health programs including the following:

The maternal and child health program includes maternity care and family planning, with the recent addition of nurse-midwives in some locations to extend and augment these services. Well-child clinics provide preventive care for infant and preschool children while the school-age child is served by the school health program. The dental program started about 12 years ago on an incremental plan and is making use of dental assistants with extended responsibilities.

Since otitis media was the leading reportable disease among Indians in 1970, there were special monies allocated for a concentrated attack on this problem, and each area office has a special otitis media program.[69]

IHS, in cooperation with Federal agencies such as the Bureau of Health Manpower Education, National Institutes of Health, and the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), has been involved in training Indians for professions and for a variety of aide positions.

The 718 community health representatives now working as Tribal employees on Indian reservations have been very helpful in improving health services. They provide health education, outreach, and education about sanitation, and they help develop resources to meet needs for transportation and other services.

Involvement of the Indian community has been another emphasis of the IHS program. In 1972 there were 30 intertribal health committees, 8 area Indian health boards, 200 reservation health committees, 200 community health committees and one national Indian Health Board.

The achievements of IHS during the past 12 years have been impressive. An increased budget from $40 million appropriated in FY 1955 to $168 million for health activities and $44.5 million for construction of health care facilities in FY 1973 has helped IHS improve its service.

One indication of improved Indian health is the drop in the infant death rate from 62.5 per 1,000 live births in 1955 to 32.2 per 1,000 live births in 1967. During the same period the U.S. infant death rate dropped from 26.4 per 1,000 live births to 22.4 per 1,000 live births. The maternal death rate for Indian women also decreased, from 82.6 per 100,000 live births in 1958 to 33.9 per 100,000 live births in 1967; the total U.S. rate was 37.6 deaths per 100,000 live births in 1958 and 28.0 per 100,000 live births in 1967.[67]

Health Care for Off-Reservation Indians

Indians living near reservations are most apt to get their health care from IHS. The other off-reservation Indians must use the usual sources of health care, including private physicians, dentists and hospitals or public clinics and hospitals. The same problems of inaccessibility, impersonal treatment, eligibility restrictions, long waits, frightening surroundings, etc., await the Indian as await all of our socioeconomically disadvantaged as they attempt to avail themselves of care.

A few off-reservation Indians who live primarily in urban centers have a chance to utilize separate Indian centers. These centers are fairly new to the city scene and generally provide a variety of social services, but occasionally have some health services available.

The Denver Indian Center is funded by OEO and provides a variety of social services to Indians, especially those who are newly arrived in Denver. These services include referral for job placement and housing, small loans, legal assistance, free clothing, food baskets, grocery orders, sewing and cooking classes, and escorted trips to the welfare department to secure food stamps. In addition to these services which help the Indian secure the necessities of life, the center provides some help with medical care. Indians are referred to medical and dental resources, and are accompanied to clinics in local health departments and public hospitals in order to help guide them through the process of getting medical care. The center also operates a well-baby clinic one day a week.[70]

An Indian center was established in Dallas about 1969. This center assists Indians in finding employment and housing, thus contributing to some basic needs that affect health. The center also provides a preschool program and sponsors a youth organization for Indians. At this time, no health activities are provided, although the need is recognized.[71]

An Indian health center has been established in San Francisco to serve an estimated 45,000 Indians in the Bay Area.

(The U.S. Census states that there were 12,011 Indians in San Francisco-Oakland Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area in 1970.) The center provides general health services, including dental and emergency care. The staff recently completed a health survey and will publish its findings.

In Seattle, Washington, Indians have established a health clinic with space donated by the Public Health Service Hospital. It is currently funded from a variety of sources, including the State Department of Health, the Regional Medical Program, and other Department of Health, Education, and Welfare sources.' The clinic staff represents a variety of disciplines--a social worker, two outreach workers, a pharmacy assistant, two dental assistants, a dental clinic coordinator, and a medical clinic coordinator. These services are augmented by professional volunteers. In addition, the National Health Service Corps has provided the clinic with a physician, a dentist and a nurse.[71]

Such Indian centers, then, are beginning to provide some health care specifically for urban Indians. The number of centers, however, is still very limited.

Health Problems of Reservation Indians

Morbidity and Mortality

Statistics about the state of health of American Indians are available mainly from the Public Health Service and cover mainly reservation Indians.

Life expectancy for Indians born in 1967 is about 64 years. This is the same as the life expectancy for all nonwhites, but it is significantly below the 71 year span for whites.[67]

The leading causes of death for Indians and the rates of deaths due to these causes in 1967 are listed below, along with the comparable rates for the total U.S. population:[67]

	Deaths per 100,000 population	
	Indian	*U.S. total*
All causes	863.8	935.7
Accidents	180.9	57.2
Diseases of the heart	140.0	364.5
Malignant neoplasms	70.9	157.2
Influenza and pneumonia excluding newborn	53.5	28.8
Certain diseases of early infancy	49.4	24.4
Vascular lesions affecting the central nervous system	48.8	102.2
Cirrhosis of the liver	38.9	14.1
Homicide	19.9	6.8
Diabetes mellitus	19.4	17.7
Suicide	17.0	10.8
Tuberculosis	16.3	3.5
Gastritis, duodenitis, enteritis and colitis, except diarrhea of the newborn	14.5	3.8
Congenital malformations	13.2	8.3
All other	181.2	136.0

(NOTE: Rates do not add to totals shown because of rounding.)

Accidents are the major cause of death in Indians and a major cause of death for all age groups except the neonate.[67] At present, information is not available classifying accidents as to location, age of victims, or circumstances.

The Aberdeen, South Dakota Area Office, responsible for Indian health in a seven-State area, reports mortality from accidents for calendar years 1969-71 as follows:

	Total rate per 100,000	*Motor vehicle*	*All other*
Indian	200.0	111.4	88.6
U.S. (all races)	54.2	26.2	28.0

These data do not separate home, highway, and industrial accidents; motor vehicle accidents associated with alcohol have been mentioned as the leading cause of death among Indians.

The 1967 death rate from diabetes mellitus among Indians was 19.4 per 100,000 population, compared to a 17.7 per 100,000 rate for the U.S. total, 17.3 for the U.S. white population, and 20.8 for all U.S. nonwhites.[67] To account for the higher rate in Indian populations compared with the white population, there is a poorly documented but general belief that Indians have some differences from other races in carbohydrate metabolism.

The importance of diabetes mellitus in maternity patients and its relationship to infant mortality is being studied at the Phoenix Indian Medical Center with support from the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases and the Indian Health Service.

While cardiovascular diseases are important causes of death for Indians, the rates are much lower than for the total U.S. population. Infectious diseases cause greater mortality among Indians than among the total population.

It is further important to note that the Indian death rate from cirrhosis of the liver, the seventh leading cause of death, is 38.9 per 100,000 as contrasted to 14.1 per 100,000 for the total U.S. population. Whether the cirrhosis is of an infectious origin or secondary to alcoholism, it constitutes a major cause of death and disability among Indians.

Morbidity statistics are available for the total Indian population but not for age groups. The leading reportable diseases in 1968 were, in order of frequency; otitis media; gastroenteritis; strep sore throat, etc.; pneumonia, excluding newborn; influenza; gonorrhea; trachoma; chickenpox; mumps; and dysentery, all forms.[72] The Public Health Service Orientation Manual for 1971 lists the leading Indian health problems in the following order; communicable diseases among children, accidents, mental health, nutritional deficiencies, alcoholism, problems of aging, and environmental health conditions. The manual states that most illnesses are due to infectious diseases (gastroenteritis, dysentery, influenza, pneumonia, tuberculosis, otitis media, trachoma, measles).[73]

Maternal death rates in the United States show the following trends for Indians and other population groupings.[67]

Year	*Maternal deaths per 100,000 live births*			
	Indian	*U.S. total*	*U.S. white*	*U.S. nonwhite*
1967	33.9	28.0	19.5	69.5
1966	54.6	29.1	20.2	72.4
1964	74.2	33.3	22.3	89.9
1962	89.7	35.2	23.8	95.9
1960	67.9	37.1	26.0	97.9
1958	82.6	37.6	26.3	101.8

The downward trend in maternal deaths in the United States is apparent. Maternal death rates for Indians are generally two to three times higher than the rates for the white population, although they are significantly lower than the rates for all nonwhites.

Family Planning

The low birth weight rate for Indians, while higher than the rate for the white population, is much lower than the rate for all nonwhites. In 1967 about 8 percent of the liveborn Indian infants weighed 2,500 grams (5-1/2 pounds) or less compared with 7 percent for whites and 14 percent for all nonwhites.[67]

More pertinent to this report is the following information from IHS concerning low birth weight rates:

Population	*Year*	*Percent low birth weight*	*Total births*
Billings Area	1971	6.9	1,051
Aberdeen Area	1971	7.3	3,911
North Dakota	1971	6.3	538
South Dakota	1971	8.2	1,334
Indians, U.S. total	1963-67	7.9	109,134

The 1967 infant mortality rate for Indians was 32.2 deaths per 1,000 live births.

A comparison with other population groupings is presented in the following table:

Population	*Year*	*Infant deaths per 1,000 live births*
U.S. Indian total[67]	1967	32.2
Neonatal		15.3
Postneonatal		16.9
U.S. white total[67]	1967	19.7
Neonatal		15.0
Postneonatal		4.7
U.S. nonwhite total[67]	1967	35.9
Neonatal		23.8
Postneonatal		12.1
Aberdeen area	1967-71	24.8
Neonatal		12.2
Postneonatal		12.6
Navajo[110]	1966	45.7

As can be seen, the Indian infant has as good a chance as the white infant of surviving the neonatal period (birth through 27 days). In the postneonatal period (28 days through 11 months), Indian infants are at a risk 4 times as great as white infants and 50 percent greater than nonwhite infants as a whole.[67] Postneonatal death rates for Indian infants are dropping but still are much higher than they should be.

With this information in mind, we should consider the major causes of death in Indian infants. The leading cause of death in the Indian neonate is immaturity; mortality due to this cause in 1966 amounted to 3.1 deaths per 1,000 live births, the same as the white rate.[67] In view of the relatively low percentage of Indian infants born at low birth weight and the high percentage of deaths in the first 28 days due to immaturity and its complications, a careful study of maturity of Indian infants at birth should be conducted.

Postneonatal death rates indicate the special vulnerability of Indian infants. The following table compares rates for Indian and U.S. total population in 1966.[67]

Causes	*Postneonatal deaths per 1,000 live births*	
	Indian	*U.S. total*
Respiratory diseases	7.1	2.5
Digestive diseases	3.6	.5
Accidents	1.9	.8
Infective and parasitic diseases	1.6	.3
Congenital malformations	1.3	1.1

The birth rate for Indians in 1968 was 38.5 per 1,000 population; the rate for whites was 16.6, and the rate for all nonwhites, 24.2.[67] The Indian birth rate is considerably higher than the nonwhite rate.

In 1963 and 1964, a study was done at the IHS Hospital in Gallup, N.M., concerning the use of intrauterine contraceptive devices (IUD). The IUD was demonstrated to be a successful method of family planning for the large group of women who were mainly illiterate and non-English-speaking and who were having their first experience with birth control and family planning.[74]

In many BIA high schools, courses on family life education include information about family planning. In addition, most of these high schools offer Teen-Age Self Improvement courses and mental health counseling. When a school on a Navajo reservation attempted to provide family planning counseling to teenage girls, however, both BIA and parents objected.

Indian cultural values may interfere with adequate family planning services and in some tribes there are religious or cultural objections. It is reported that in one Sioux tribe, a husband who found that his wife was taking the pill threw the supply away. Nonetheless, Indians are generally well aware of the need and desirability of good family planning. More efforts need to be made to provide a full range of family planning services in conjunction with general health care for families.

Dental Care

Dental care is a major need for Indians. Surveys show that among the Blackfeet and Fort Belknap Indians periodontal disease is a major oral health problem and is the main reason for the high rate and low age at which teeth are lost. Gingivitis is common, along with a high rate of debris accumulation. Virtually all the White Mountain Apache preschool children who were examined had significant dental disease.[72]

The IHS dental program has established guidelines for planning, setting objectives and goals, and carrying out dental care to Indians. Such programs are based on data regarding epidemiological factors such as climate, accessibility, methods of water delivery to communities and the ability to fluoridate the water which are important considerations in planning such programs. New careers are being established in the field of dental therapy. Efforts are being made to train the dentist to be the manager of a program as well as the provider of care.[75] About 12 years ago an incremental program was started with the youngest children, and by 1973 most children had been enrolled in a maintenance program.

While the dental program is good, there is not enough money to extend the service to all reservation Indians.

Nutrition

Malnutrition is another health problem of Indians, especially the children. The book "Nutrition, Growth and Development of North American Indian Children" reviewed a number of studies on Indian children diagnosed clinically or biochemically as having malnutrition. The incidence ranged from .001 percent to 14 percent of hospitalized children, with malnutrition being diagnosed as general malnutrition, anemia or weights below the norm for chronological age. Nutrition surveys using the norms of the Iowa and Boston Standards reveal a preponderance of children falling well below the normal growth rate.[72]

In the Billings area during 1967-68, there were 31 child inpatients diagnosed as nutritionally deficient and 341 cases of anemia in children. Twenty-four of the former cases were attributed to neglect by mothers who were either alcoholic or incompetent. Information from the Aberdeen area revealed a high incidence of infant and preschool anemia.

Studies show that other Americans have been getting taller and heavier with each generation but Indians have not. Only experience with good nutrition will show if American Indians are currently reaching their genetic potential for height. Dietary surveys have revealed mild to marked deficiencies in the intakes of calories, calcium, riboflavin, vitamin A, and vitamin C that were substantially below those considered to meet normal needs. The survey of Blackfeet and Fort Belknap Indians of Montana, the Dakota Study of eight BIA boarding schools, and the study of Alaska Natives showed deficient intakes of vitamin A and C and calcium and, except among the Eskimos, borderline protein intakes.

The cause for malnutrition among Indians is complex. Eating patterns are affected by food acculturation, limitations in food availability, changes in breast-feeding patterns, and poverty.

All American Indians, including the Alaska Natives, have been forced into extensive food acculturation because of loss of lands, disappearance of game, and hunting restrictions. New foods introduced by trading posts as a result of modern food technology and advertising campaigns have often been low in nutritive values. Flour, sugar, coffee, salt, lard, soda pop, Kool-Aid, candy, and crackers are foods with poor nutritive value that have replaced native foods. Such a high carbohydrate diet also has implications for the extent of dental disease.

Frequently the trading post is the only source of foods, and fruits and vegetables are not available. When the trading post or grocery store is many miles from home, transportation difficult, and refrigeration absent, high carbohydrate foods are apt to be chosen. Welfare recipients may get commodity foods on many reservations but availability depends on current surplus and the local administration. The number of foods deemed surplus is steadily decreasing. Many of the surplus foods are unfamiliar to Indians, and if the women are not taught how to prepare them, they will not be eaten. Furthermore, commodity foods are generally not good sources of vitamin A and C.

Another serious effect of acculturation of food habits is the increased use of bottle feeding rather than breast feeding. In Alaska it is common to breast feed but frequently only until the child is 2 months of age. Also, a study found a substantial number of infants over 12 months of age on breast milk or formula without supplementary foods. Navajo mothers were breast feeding slightly over one-third of their infants, and among the Micmac, Ojibwa, and Iroquois, breast feeding has declined both in popularity and duration, with canned milk being substituted almost universally. The decline in breast feeding is a problem because Indian mothers may substitute formula which is hard to prepare sanitarily.

The role of breast feeding in immunological development is still poorly defined. Nonetheless it is known that in developing countries as women become sophisticated and stop breast feeding, both malnutrition and infant mortality increase.[76]

The extreme poverty of most Indians is another factor in their poor nutritional status. The average Indian family of five on a reservation is living on an annual income of below $2,000. Many families are receiving welfare but the payments vary from State to State. In Montana the monthly allowance for a family of five is $226 and in Wyoming it is $215. The cost of a nutritionally adequate low-cost diet is computed at $131.24 per month for a family of five.[72]

The consequences of poor nutritional status are highly significant. With reduced nutrition status, a child is more susceptible to disease, and the course of the disease is apt to be more difficult. The preschool and school-aged child may reflect poor nutrition by retarded growth. Other complications of states of chronic undernutrition are lowered energy and lessened concentration and attentiveness in the learning situation. If the child has had a poor physical and nutritional start, we can expect his achievement to be poor.

Sanitation and Housing

On the lower Greasewood Reservation in Arizona, 596 (74 percent) of the 808 inhabitants were studied. The average family size was 5.5 persons; 44 percent of the families lived in one-room hogans, 29 percent in primitive two-room houses, and 27 percent in houses of three or more rooms. Thirty-five percent lived in houses without sanitary facilities. Another 41 percent lived in homes with poorly constructed outhouses. Twenty-two percent had indoor toilets. A few families had wells, usually some distance from their homes.[72]

On the Fort Apache Reservation in Arizona, the families of 200 preschool children were studied. Three-forths of the families included six or more persons; the majority lived in dwelling units of four or less rooms. One-third had indoor toilets; 85 percent of the families used community piped water, 11 percent used water from springs, streams, and lakes; and the remainder from wells, cisterns or unknown sources.[72]

The lack of a safe water supply and generally poor sanitation is a major cause of infection manifested as gastrointestinal disease.[77] The Indians in Region VIII must contend with very severe weather, and for them, adequate housing is particularly important for health. In fact, the combination of unsafe water, inadequate housing and heating, exposure to harsh elements, poor diet and lack of information about hygiene results in an unusually high incidence of infectious disease within the Indian population.

Construction of water supplies and waste disposal facilities are included as part of IHS responsibility.[70] Some major efforts have been made to bring Indian sanitation facilities up to standard but much remains to be done.[77]

Some efforts had been made to provide adequate housing on the reservation but problems arose. In one instance the Indians failed to pay their housing notes to the Tribal Housing Authority because they were not used to paying for housing, and in some cases their incomes were too low to pay for housing along with their other needs and wishes. Since this solution did not work, many Indians will continue to live in unsafe housing with poor sanitation until a better solution to providing housing is found.

Simply supplying more adequate housing is not the total answer either. When families move to better housing, unfamiliarity with the new housing and equipment (stoves, heating units, sewage disposal) causes accidents. Unfamiliarity and fear may prohibit the Indian from using the new facility effectively, thereby negating the solution of the problem for which the new housing was provided. For example, fear of using the gas heater may mean the family is still exposed to the cold.

A number of other problems exist that have major and direct bearing on the Indian's ability to utilize health services.

Poverty

Underlying the poor housing and sanitation as well as many other problems affecting health care for Indians is the problem of poverty. As noted, the average Indian family of five on a reservation is living on an annual income of below $2,000.

Welfare payments are generally too low to provide for minimal needs. Unemployment in March of 1970 for Indians 16 years of age and older was 40 percent compared with the national average of 4.4 percent.[72] Attempts have been made to establish small manufacturing and tourist businesses on some reservations, but so far this has not been enough to provide the needed number of jobs, especially in the light of the increasing Indian population.

Distance and Communication Problems

The accessibility of services on the reservations is hampered by the great distances and the communication problems. Many patients have to depend on hitchhiking or costly rides from neighbors to get to health facilities. Such dependency frequently makes it impossible to keep appointments.

The Rosebud Reservation (S.D.) tried to establish a bus system. The attitude of the Indians was that this service was a tribal service and should be provided for them free of charge. They therefore refused to pay the fares to support the system and it failed. Phones are scarce on the reservations, although there usually is one available somewhere in each of the communities of any size.

There are still sizeable portions of the older Indian population that do not speak English. Although interpreters are used in the health facilities, there may be much lost in the translation. Landuage barriers are just an example of the cultural differences between Indian users and non-Indian providers.

Indian Health Service Problems

The Indian Health Service has never had enough funds to provide all of the necessary health care to the reservation Indian. Some well-conceived programs cannot be fully implemented and other needed programs simply cannot be undertaken. Some of the facilities cannot accommodate additional health staff that might become available to increase services.

The staff now available to provide health care are quite limited in numbers. In one instance it is reported that a single public health nurse is responsible for 9,000 patients. Lack of funds precludes hiring additional staff, professional or subprofessional. Recruitment of professional manpower is particularly difficult because of the isolated and remote nature of the reservation locations. Once on the reservations, IHS staff suffer from bordom and isolation just as the Indians themselves do. The pending termination of the physician draft will likely increase the difficulty of recruiting physicians.

The monies allotted for hospitalization of patients at off-reservation facilities is also inadequate. Every effort is made to utilize Federal hospitals (Veterans Administration, military, Public Health Service) because of the lower hospital per diem cost.

At times the attitude of Indian health personnel, whether they are Indian or non-Indian, can be detrimental to the acceptability of service. When non-Indian staff members come to remote IHS locations, there is some orientation provided as to cultural differences, but this is not generally given by Indian employees. IHS staff are then apt to live in a separate area with superior housing and a totally different life style from the Indians they have come to serve. Little time can be spent in familiarizing the physician who is on a 2-year assignment with the local Indian culture.

This isolation and lack of cultural orientation is apt to lead to inappropriate recommendations from the health providers to Indian patients. For instance, the physician may relate a treatment schedule to three meals a day when the family pattern does not include three regular meals.

Cultural Barriers

There are additional cultural barriers which interfere with the effective delivery of health care to Indians. IHS facilities may seem strange and foreign to the Indian users. There are limited numbers of Indians employed in the health disciplines responsible for delivering care; and, when Indians are employed, they tend to be at the nonprofessional and lower-paying levels.

There are 38 Indian physicians in the United States, but only four work for IHS. Basic hostilities that may remain between Indians and non-Indians hinder full utilization of services.

Certainly the IHS has made a concerted effort to develop a liaison role by way of the community health representatives. The success of that effort has already been mentioned. There is increased involvement of Indians in making tha hard decisions around their health services. More intertribal committees and health boards are developing but it would appear that many of them do not as yet have real authority, nor do their members understand their responsibilities in terms of deciding on health programs. Additional education must be undertaken to alhow such bodies to function as policy-making boards. Furthermore, there may be some problems around the attitudes of the health professionals themselves, who are simply not used to the idea of consumer involvement in making decisions about health policy. The director of the National Indian Health Board has expressed the hope that the local boards would become more than advisory.

Jurisdictional Disputes

One large additional set of barriers to the delivery of health care to Indians is created by jurisdictional disputes.

The Administration's policy holds that reservation Indians as bona fide U.S. citizens should obtain health services from State and local sources, but that the Indian Health Service is responsible as a residual resource for insuring that health services are available and provided to Indians.

The Indian people have taken the position that medical care is a treaty right and the responsibility of the Federal Government alone, so that receiving health services from State and local programs constitutes a threat of termination to them or another example of the Federal Government's shirking its responsibility.

On the other hand, States and local health programs and particularly State medicaid programs are reluctant to extend coverage to reservation Indians since they also consider themselves as residual resources for Indians. Such jurisdictional disagreements have tended to result in failure to maximize limited health care resources to the best advantage. Further, these disputes plus limited funds often result in IHS policies that cause problems for Indians.

IHS is accused of "red tape" policies that interfere with the utilization of care when those policies actually are designed to conserve inadequate dollars. Examples include apparently restrictive criteria for eligibility for IHS care, and the requirement for preauthorization when an IHS recipient requires care in a non-Indian setting.

Generally the State health departments' maternal and child health programs (MCH) have assumed that IHS is responsible for and taking care of most of the basic MCH services for reservation Indians in the State. State crippled children's service (CC) agencies have provided services to reservation Indians in a number of instances.

A February 1971 report indicated that the following States spent MCH and CC funds for health services to Indians: Colorado expended $15,000 for Indians, of which $7,000 was MCH money; Montana spent $18,414 for hearing aids, care of cleft palate children, and CC services, primarily for hearing problems. In Lewis and Clark County, Montana, 56 Indian families were served in the Children and Youth (C&Y) project. In North Dakota, 56 Indians received services, which included mastoid operations, for $13,233; in South Dakota it is estimated that 10 percent of the CC money is spent for Indians; four of South Dakota's 12 CC clinics are on or near reservations. In Utah, during 1970, 59 Indians were cared for in the CC program and 2.3 percent of clinic visits were by Indians with an estimated expenditure of $19,000.

In addition, Utah has a contract with San Juan County for generalized service, including family planning for the Navajo Indians. Wyoming spent $12,000 for hearing aids, cleft palate children, dental health and other services.

Health Problems of Off-Reservation Indians

The health problems of off-reservation Indians, who are generally in urban areas, are very little different from the problems of reservation Indians. There are, however, some areas in which differentiation of reservation and urban Indians is not a very clear cut one, as Indian populations move back and forth from urban to reservation settings. One consultant told us that a fairly typical pattern would be as follows:

An Indian family moves to an urban setting, locates housing and a job, and appears to settle down. Often homesickness follows and the family remembers the pleasant parts of reservation living. The family is then apt to return to the reservation, giving up the job and housing situation. After a period of time back on the reservation, the family discovers that the nostalgia is not reality. At that point they accept the advantages of urban living and move back to the city and again have to locate housing and employment.

Morbidity and Mortality

We do not currently have specific statistics about the health of urban Indians. A number of efforts are underway to obtain such data.

A study conducted in the Seattle area found that sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS) occurs up to four times as often in Indian infants as in white infants.[78]

Poverty

Because unemployment is so widespread on reservations, many Indians go to the cities looking for jobs and a better life. The Indian is apt to be unskilled and the type and quality of education available to him has not prepared him for competition in the city; therefore, he can generally expect to obtain only low-paying jobs.

The Indian needs help in finding a job and may run into difficulties with the usual social service resources, e.g., employment placement and job counseling. First, he does not know that the resources exist; second, he is distrustful of the white man's institutions; and last some State social service directors and employment department directors do not provide services to Indians because they think that the BIA has this responsibility.

Sometimes the Indian cannot find a job or is laid off, or the pressures of city life break up the family. The urban Indian now faces the many problems of getting welfare assistance, such as, Does he know welfare is available, where it is available, how he can cope with proving eligibility? Does the welfare department think this is a BIA responsibility? Is the worker prejudiced? In many instances, if an Indian applies to an agency for assistance, he is reffered to another agency because of the misconception that Indians receive special privileges from the Federal Government and are somehow taken care of.[71]

Indians have reported difficulties in getting food stamps. They have no experience with this process on the reservation because food stamps are not available there, although commodity foods are. The inability to get food stamps may seriously hamper their getting an adequate diet.

Transportation and Communication

Distances and transportation problems are perhaps as real for the off-reservation Indian as for those on the reservations. Health care resources, once located, are apt to be a considerable distance away and public transportation in urban settings is hardly responsive to anyone's needs. Communication is easier in the urban setting as phones are generally available. The urban Indian community, though scattered, sets up an effective person-to-person communication system.

107

Housing

The low-income urban Indian may have as much difficulty in buying adequate housing and may face similar problems with sanitation, safe water supply, and unfamiliarity with new equipment as his brothers on the reservation. In addition, the urban Indian may face racial prejudice in finding housing. In March 1973 a Denver TV station showed a documentary entitled "Why Did Gloria Die?" The heroine of the story, Gloria, had been on welfare and her friends told of inadequate heat, rain that leaked in, electricity that was turned off, and other problems. Other Indians recounted stories of being turned away when looking for housing if the "Indian-looking" husband accompanied the wife on the house-hunting trip. The settings for this telecast were Minneapolis, Detroit, and the midwestern region.

Obtaining Health Care

The Indian who comes to live in the city faces new problems in seeking health care. Familiar with receiving free health services from IHS facilities, he must now learn to find a physician and buy health services. Finding a satisfactory physician in a new city is a problem for many U.S. citizens.

The indigent Indian usually does not use Medicaid because of his lack of knowledge about this source of assistance, his fear of the white man's institution and because of pride. He may find it difficult to prove eligibility, and the welfare agency may think he is ineligible because IHS is taking care of him.

If the Indian goes to a public facility, he must learn to use identification cards, to respond to questions about income and expenditures in order to prove eligibility and to cope with part-payment mechanisms. In addition, he has the new experience of mingling with patients of other ethnic groups and may be additionally handicapped with transportation problems and language difficulties.

Long waits in clinics and the impersonality of the clinic staff are complaints of the urban Indian. He may also become confused about jurisdictional boundaries for delivery of service, such as the possibility of being eligible for services if he lives on one side of the street but not if he lives on the other.

Cultural Barriers

Most off-reservation and some reservation Indians must use private hospital facilities. The staffs of urban hospitals are usually completely unknowledgeable about cultural differences, community resources, and special Indian needs. Consequently the services offered may not be acceptable to the Indian user.

Medical practice in the United States in private offices and particularly in clinics is characterized by impersonality, long waits for service, and brief explanations. For the Indian, whose life style is based on interpersonal relations, this can mean cultural shock.

Jurisdictional Disputes

Jurisdictional disputes, already mentioned above, further disrupt the availability of health care for the urban Indian.

There are some significant problems concerning payment by IHS for care provided to patients who have left the reservation. As a matter of fact, one tribal affairs officer stated that there is a definite polarization in regard to use of IHS dollars between Indians who remain on the reservation and those who leave. Some tribal health leaders have voiced strong opposition to IHS having to pay for care for the members who are no longer on the reservation when those funds have to come from the contract health services budget. On the other side, of course, the Indian who has left the reservation may need this coverage to obtain care.

There seems to be a great deal of confusion about Indian students who are eligible for IHS coverage but apparently are expected to return to IHS facilities for such care. Some IHS staff may feel that students who are away from the reservation are not full-time residents eligible for IHS care. The students themselves have great difficulty in getting transportation to service units for health care, and may not be able to pay for private care. Additional problems that students have related include the difficulty of getting eyeglasses, dental care, and phychiatric services. Such problems are obvious barriers to the maximum utilization of educational opportunities by Indian students.

Suggested Solutions to Indian Health Problems

The first suggested solution to Indian health problems is that Indian people be maximally involved in the identification of the health problems, their causes and alternative solutions. Experts from various Federal agencies, such as IHS and other components of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and others, should provide their expertise in exploring with the Indian people the relationship of various levels of problems to the poor health status of Indian people. The Indians themselves, with this additional expertise available, should establish priorities among the specific health problems to be remedied and participate in decisions about which alternative solutions will be attempted.

Some of the problems identified in this report are not yet fully explored or understood. Continued efforts to understand the problems and to formulate solutions should be an ongoing activity.

Accidents

In view of the prominence of accidents as the major cause of death for Indian populations, we recommended that area offices, service units or urban Indian centers do a major study of the incidence of accidents, breaking them down into home, motor vehicle and industrial accidents and specifically studying the nature of accidental injuries and deaths for age groupings. Such information would allow the development of a specific accident prevention effort to curb this major cause of morbidity and mortality among Indians.

Morbidity and Mortality

The special efforts to combat otitis media should be continued. Other causes of morbidity tend to be due to infectious diseases which are aggravated by the poor living conditions, crowding, lack of health information, and limits of available and acceptable care. Suggested solutions for these problems are presented later in this section.

About 8 percent of liveborn Indian infants weighed 2,500 grams or less compared with 7 percent for whites and 14 percent for all nonwhites, as noted. Although this low birth weight rate does not seem unduly high, Indian infants have a significant neonatal death rate due to ipmaturity and prematurity. There needs to be some careful assessment of clinical gestational status and comparison with estimated gestational age to try to determine the true incidence of immaturity in Indian infants who may have larger than expected birth weights for gestational age.

Maternity patient's carbohydrate metabolism should be carefully explored in view of the fact that infants of diabetic mothers are apt to weigh more than expected for gestational age but are less mature than expected.

The reported high incidence of SIDS should be documented for Indians. Efforts to inform IHS staff and the Indian people about SIDS and its nature would be particularly important if there are excessive numbers of Indian infant deaths from this cause. All help-givers who are apt to come in contact with this situation need to know the facts about SIDS so as to dispel the guilt associated with such unexplained deaths. As research progresses to define the cause or causes of SIDS there should be particular efforts to apply the research findings to Indian populations.

Strengthening Maternal and Child Health Services

Special emphasis should be placed on the health care for mothers and children because "prevention is the most logical and economical approach to health care."[79] While mothers and children are affected by whatever affects the health of the family and the total population, and though the biological demands of reproduction and of growth and development make them especially vulnerable to health hazards, they are the group which most readily responds to preventive measures. In countries which place a high value on the child, as well as on the benefits of prevention, maternal and child health services form the basic structure around which additional family health services are established.

Since we are addressing the needs of a low-income population who can look back on generations of deprivation, it is important to assist the Indian population in strengthening their basic MCH program. As in developing countries, such a program should be the most inclusive possible and should be undertaken second only to improved sanitation and adequate water supply. An MCH program improvement might well require the following:

1. Reorder priorities in IHS so that maternal and child health activities make further impact on Indian morbidity and mortality.

2. Significantly increase the health care dollars so that acute care needs can continue to be met while MCH program is strengthened.

3. Maximize the acceptability, accessibility, appropriateness, and availability of MCH services to Indian families.

4. Eliminate boarding schools in the interest of mental and probably physical health. It is generally agreed that children, especially young children, fare better living in family units with their parents where they can receive protection, love and guidance from parental figures. Institutional settings are generally detrimental.

5. Include family life education in its broadest sense in the curriculum of all school children from kindergarten through secondary school. Such content must include information about good health habits and attitudes, human relationships, adult responsibilities, parenting skills, etc.

As with all such course work, there must be Indian involvement in the design, content and teaching. Tribal councils, school boards and other influential groups should decide on how much of the traditional Indian culture is taught and how much non-Indian culture is transmitted. Ideally, the content should recognize and build on the strengths of the Indian heritage.

6. Expand and add nurse-midwifery programs to hospital staffs and field services. Nurse-midwives are excellent sources of additional health manpower to work with physicians and other professional personnel in providing maternity care, newborn services and health counseling.

Family Planning

Men and women should be educated about family planning. Some family planning methods are more useful for certain populations than others. Therefore, a variety of medically sound and culturally acceptable methods should be made available to Indian couples.

Nurse-midwives may also be used to provide family planning counseling to both men and women, and to provide supervision of interconceptional care.

Dental Health Services

The incremental care program in IHS should be continued. Services might be expanded by purchasing fluoridation equipment and installing it for the water supplies of communities, schools and residential facilities that house children. Topical fluoride applications might be expanded to reach children not presently being served by the fluoridation efforts. Dental care might also be expanded to serve expectant mothers.

Nutrition

Malnutrition is a significant problem in Indian populations on the reservations. Here are some suggestions for improving nutrition:

1. Foods should be made more readily available in an acceptable fashion to the Indian on the reservation.

   a. Provide information to the parents about infant and child nutrition. This could be done by community health representatives or nutrition aides who are taught counseling on foods and nutrition, or by nutritionists.

   b. Make available on the reservation the foods necessary for good nutrition, particularly fruits, vegetables, milk and eggs. Provide adequate transportation so that these foods can be carried home without spoiling, and provide refrigeration at home so that the foods can be properly stored. Further suggestions will be made in the sections on transportation and sanitation and housing.

c. Protect indigenous foods by various legal and programmatic approaches.[80] An example of this is protecting Indian hunting and fishing rights, and protecting the survival of the species which the Indian hunts and fishes.

d. Expand Head Start and school food programs, which have undoubtedly improved the nutrition of Indian children, to include free breakfasts and lunches in all schools with a substantial number of Indian students.

e. Consider transfer of the responsibility for Federal food assistance programs from USDA to DHEW. The White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health made this suggestion with the hope that DHEW could better assure that foods available through the commodity food program would be chosen on the basis of nutritional needs, cultural patterns and the facilities available for home preparation.[80]

f. Require enrichment and/or fortification of foods commonly distributed and sold on reservations.[80]

g. Indian tribes should be made eligible for Federal programs that are now available to States. Examples include welfare assistance and food stamp programs.

2. Another set of suggestions has to do with eliminating poverty on the reservation (see also the section on poverty).

a. Expansion of the available income for food, for both reservation and nonreservation Indians, might be possible through the department of cooperatives of buyers' clubs and by the use of home gardens.

b. Reduce the cost of purchased food on the reservations by law and regulate the prices and profits of traders.

3. Since breast feeding is decreasing in popularity among Indian women and this decline may be implicated in excessive gastrointestinal disease in infancy, ways of encouraging and enhancing breast feeding for more adequate periods of time should be undertaken.[76] There should be more additional and careful investigation of the role of breast feeding in avoiding milk allergy, gastrointestinal disease, and infection. Of course, in order to make breast feeding successful, the mother's diet has to be nutritionally adequate.

Sanitation and Housing

The problems involving sanitation and housing are difficult for the reservation Indian to solve. Increased income could make it possible for Indian families to buy better housing with safe water and adequate sanitary facilities. It would appear to be important for IHS to continue its efforts to make safe water supplies and sewage disposal systems generally available to reservation Indians. Community health representatives or sanitation aides do and can continue to play an important role in educating Indians about proper sanitation and safe water supplies.

Additional financing by, and increased cooperation with, HUD is a possible route to improvement in housing. Perhaps a housing co-op could be developed on reservations with construction done by the Indians who are trained in these skills. Community health representatives or homemaking aides should be available to help families learn to manage improved housing so that new heating apparatus, refrigerators, and other unfamiliar features are not left unused or do not become hazards to families.

Poverty

Poverty is obviously a major, overriding barrier to health care in general. Solutions to poverty have evaded our society for a very long time. Nonetheless, one simple solution for eliminating poverty which has been tried in the United States, is to simply give each citizen the basic necessities of life, i.e., housing, clothing and food. If this is not possible or not acceptable to reservation Indians, efforts should be made to improve the income of the Indians by maximizing their employment and by increasing the welfare allowance to cover the basic needs.

Transportation and Communication

Many of the transportation and communication problems of Indians on reservations result from the fact that Indians live scattered over wide areas. This was not the custom for many Indian tribes before contact with the white man, but was instituted in a futile and unsuccessful attempt to make farmers out of Indians. Before this effort was made, many tribes lived and travelled together in communal fashion. Larger communities of Indian populations would result if adequate jobs and industries were developed on the resrvations.

If Indians lived in larger communities, telephones would be more readily available and communication problems would be lessened. Transportation, too, would be a much less severe problem as many of the necessary services for Indians would be readily available in the communities.

Indian tribes and other tribal councils should be approached as to their attitudes in this regard, but a solution will require major undertakings around developments of industries and jobs on the reservation.

If it is not possible or acceptable to increase the number of Indians living in communities, another solution for the major transportation problem is suggested. A thorough study of the current transportation problems, methods, facilities and patterns should be made for a natural service area. This study should not concentrate on transportation patterns for health care, but should include all of the transportation activities whether individual or group, private of governmental, etc. With this information, some different ways of capitalizing on existing transportation availability might be possible. For instance, there are certain existing vehicles that travel on fairly set schedules, including commercial delivery trucks, school buses, and mail trucks and other Federal vehicles. Such a study might also have implications for the times at which services are offered.

An alternate suggestion is that the model of a bus transportation system used on the Papago Reservation in Sells, Arizona, 65 miles from Tucson, be reviewed for applicability or adaptability to other reservation settings. Also, the Department of Transportation, as a member agency of the Federal Regional Council, should be involved in seeking means of obtaining or leasing buses for reservation transportation systems. Priorities need to be set up through a feasibility study. Such a study would take into consideration such factors as the availability of roads, locations of IHS facilities, existing patterns of transportation for patients without private means, etc. The Health Program Systems Center in Tucson, Arizona, can serve as source for information with respect to conducting surveys on reservations.

Indian Health Service Problems

The Indian people may wish to consider the pros and cons of participation in a national health insurance plan sometime in the future. If such insurance provides for adequate payment for health services for everyone, this would relieve the problem of inadequate funds for buying and providing health service. IHS could then continue to be the health delivery system, and be paid under the national plan rather than by special appropriation.

An alternate suggestion is that sufficient appropriations be made to IHS so that comprehensive health services can be provided for all Indian people living on the reservation.

Staffing is a serious problem for IHS. The staff might be more easily recruited and retained if they were offered special pay categories for hardship locations, additional authorized leave for ongoing education and more vacation time then is normally allowed.

Professional staff working on reservations need particular efforts made on their behalf so that they can maintain their professional expertise. Travel costs and time off to attend postgraduate education courses, workshops and seminars are important. Another suggestion [illegible] that more continuing education be taken to IHS facilities from the medical centers. These types of opportunities could help combat the recruitment and morale problems of IHS employees who live and work on the reservations. Better morale and less loneliness and boredom should result in better health services to reservation Indians.

The non-Indian IHS staff need an adequate orientation to the local Indian culture. This orientation should be by Indians and it should include introduction to important members of the community. Only with this kind of sensitization will IHS staff be able to provide acceptable services to Indians.

There have been some poorly documented allegations about Indians having very significant complaints about the health care they receive but being afraid to report those complaints. In view of the fact that Indians are totally dependent on IHS for their health care, such fear is certainly understandable. There should be an increased, specific effort on the part of IHS staff to establish complaint and grievance mechanisms. Grievances can be heard, investigated and corrected in such a way that both sides learn and gain from the experience.

Cultural Barriers

There are, as indicated, major cultural barriers to Indians fully utilizing IHS sources. The orientation of non-Indian IHS staff will help to correct some of these barriers. In addition, it is important that Indian health workers such as community health representatives or medicine men participate in the education of the patient. Medicine men are respected by many Indians for their ability and work in close partnership with physicians. In some instances, additional training is currently being provided to medicine men.

Indian involvement in the delivery of care must be increased. Young Indians should be encouraged to study to become health professionals or paraprofessionals. In order to do this, more Indian educators will need to use Indian role models for children and youth. Indians who are in health delivery roles should have decision-making responsibility wherever possible.

There is more Indian involvement today in decisions about total health care by way of the Indian health boards, councils and committees. Individual members should be given extensive education in the role and function of such organizations. DHEW could perhaps provide some expertise in this effort, either directly or by contract. Once educated, these organizations should be put in truly policy-making positions. It should be mandatory that their decisions be carried out as long as they are not inappropriate ones requiring medical expertise.

Jurisdictional Disputes

Additional services could be provided for reservation Indians if State agencies worked together for maximization of the available services to Indians. For instance, IHS should work closely with the State Medicaid agencies to assure that the early and periodic screening, diagnosis, and treatment are available to Indian children who are eligible for Medicaid, just as these required services are available to other eligible children who are residents of the State. An alternate solution is for the responsible health agency to make the services available to the reservation just as it makes those services available throughout the rest of the State. This has recently been done by the Montana State Department of Health and Environmental Sciences in two reservation areas. Other Medicaid provisions should be made available to eligible reservation Indians, just as they are made available to other residents.

It is important that clear-cut statements of eligibility be made for health services and the responsibilities of IHS, State health departments and other health agencies. Indian people should have a voice in establishing these policies, and should be adequately informed about the policies once they are established.

117

State health department staffs should consider the health needs on reservations as they assess total needs in the State. The Indian people and IHS should then be involved in decisions about whose dollars will be used in what way to address the needs that are found.

Tribal councils are probably eligible for more HEW grants for health services delivery than we realize. As tribal councils and Indian health boards increase their capability and authority, they will be in a better position to make use of such grants.

Special Problems of Off-Reservation Indians

First of all, the Indian who leaves the reservation and goes to the city needs a skill that will permit him to earn a decent living. BIA and the Office of Education might cooperate in working out plans for job training experiences for urban Indians.

BIA should continue to expand its program for Indian relocatees. This pro-ram includes thorough medical, physical and psychological examinations, employment assistance and accurate, practical orientation for urban living. BIA should continue to monitor the adjustments of Indian relocatees and provide arrangements with health personnel for their counseling. These activities should be continued until the relocatees and tribal authorities determine to discontinue them.

Vine Deloria, Jr., a Standing Rock Sioux Indian, past Executive Director of the National Congress of American Indians, believes the future of Indian affairs lies with the urban Indian. He stresses that one-half of American Indians already live in cities and more are expected because there are more jobs and opportunities in the city as contrasted to the reservation. Deloria recommends Federal funding for urban center enclaves built near towns and smaller cities. Such centers would provide training and employment placement and should include close coordination with Indian urban centers and individual tribes. An example is the Sioux City Indian Center which is a focal point for coordination of employment, housing, education, and related activities for Indians in four States. This center was established in 1969.

To help the non-reservation Indian get health care, the use of already existing health facilities should be maximized. This would include an agency such as BIA or an Indian center making the relocated Indian aware of the health resources available to him and effecting needed referrals. In addition, members of the Indian center or BIA could accompany Indians to the health facility and guide them through the strange process. The provider staff could receive some inservice education about the culture of Indians, their health needs, problems and community resources. It would also help if clinics and hospitals would hire Indians, who could be trained the same way as community health representatives to do outreach and interpretation to both the Indian patient and health facility staff.

It would be most helpful if Federal agencies carefully monitored any health facility receiving Federal funds to see that Indians are given the services to which they are entitled and that those services are given in courteous and helpful ways.

Another suggestion is that separate health facilities for Indians be established. These facilities could be in connection with an Indian center or urban Indian enclave, or they may be free-standing. The services offered would be those generally needed for good ambulatory health care. Funding would obviously be a problem, but such separate services might be more acceptable to Indians.

If an Indian loses his job or is unable to work, he should be able to receive public assistance. State and local welfare directors should be advised that Indians are eligible for welfare allowances, and the Federal agency should monitor the local agencies to see that Indians receive the help to which they are entitled. If Indians are able to get public assistance, they would also be eligible for Medicaid.

This Regional Office receives many calls urgently requesting help in locating and paying for health care. The large number of calls and inquiries warrants consideration of special appropriations to pay for emergency health care, particularly hospital care, for urban Indians when no other source of funds can be found.

Coordination of Services

Within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a full-time position has been planned for each regional office to provide liaison between other health service agencies and the Indian Health Service. The liaison officer would serve on the staff of the regional health director, with direct responsibility for drawing the health interests of the regional office and IHS closer together. He would also be responsible for seeking, coordinating, and facilitating health services that can be integrated with other funding sources.

He would work directly with State health departments, medical centers, and voluntary health organizations in highlighting the needs of Indians for service, discussing their special cultural problems, and helping social agencies who work with Indians become aware of health resources. There is a need to provide such a regional focal point to work with the Regional Councils in matters involving health services for all Indians.

Excerpt From American Indian Policy Review Commission Report

Urban Indian health care needs, as many other problems facing Indians, echo those of the rural Indian.[81]

Need for additional facilities, doctors, medicine, general health information and care is high. The urban Indian, however, does not have the same access to existing health care facilities as his rural counterpart, as many of the facilities have been centralized on or near reservation communities. Even these are remote for rural Indians. Testimonies have indicated that, particularly in off-reservation areas local non-Indian health service hospitals are reluctant to accept Indian patients for fear they will not receive payment and frequently refer most patients to distant Indian hospitals if cash or financial responsibility cannot be verified.

General lack of information among the non-Indian community about Indians living in urban or rural non-reservation communities often results in similar referrals of Indians who have lived off-reservation for most of their lives, and has even included those carrying health insurance.

Generally, new Indian arrivals to urban areas are unfamiliar with existing health facilities and are uncertain as to whether they are eligible for such health services. These Indians are often reluctant to go to local hospitals because of financial barriers until they are within means of visiting an Indian health facility and so they usually wait, risking more serious illnesses in the process. In addition, testimonies indicate Indians may hesitate to use existing facilities because of language barriers, limited knowledge about available services, alternative methods of payment and health insurance programs, etc.

Existing health care facilities in urban areas, city, state and county, have not worked with Federal Indian Health Services agencies to assure general cooperation in services, particularly in identifying urban Indian health needs, much less preparing a comprehensive approach to meeting these needs.

Without a doubt the identification of urban Indian health care needs is crucially lacking. Indian agencies interested in assuring services to Indians in urban communities are finding it difficult to obtain specific needs statements from existing health agencies.

Indeed, as most agencies attempting to service Indians in, urban areas, it has been difficult to accurately determine such basic data as the current urban Indian population figure. (See section under Housing relating to problems of enumerating a highly transient population.)

Some urban Indian health agencies, often a board of representatives from boards of various health agencies and Indian people from the urban communities, have instrumented general health education programs which, through vehicles such as the Indian Community Health Representatives, or other combinations of paraprofessionals and outreach workers, have succeeded in providing the urban Indian with information about existing agencies and about basic health maintenance in areas of nutrition, prenatal and postnatal care, etc.

The need for additional alcoholism treatment centers cannot be overlooked. Indian persons testifying at hearings conducted by this task force indicate that, particularly in off-reservation border towns, alcoholism treatment centers are far from adequate. Current alcoholism control methods involve little or no therapeutic services and the problem drinker is left to face repeated incarcerations, fines and release with little opportunity to examine alternatives. Local governments of many off-reservation border towns limit the development of facilities and programs because they feel that such care must be a responsibility of the Indian Health Service or feel they lack jurisdiction to deal with such social problems. Again, there is lack of adequate and specific coordination of efforts.

Pervading the many Indian health problems in urban areas, and rural areas, is the need for additional employment of Indian personnel, and alternatively, the need to inform key personnel in existing city, county and state facilities about Indian health problems, Indian rights to services.

Findings

Urban Indian health needs have gone largely unassessed, other than basic assumptions that the health problems of urban Indians are similar to those of rural Indian communities and those of reservation communities.

Existing off-reservation health agencies have not, for the most part, assumed responsibility toward either assessing or meeting the specific health needs of urban Indians.

Relevance of Indian Life to Civilization

by Frank McLemore

As Rome hid its debt to the Etruscans, Americans have obscured its inheritance from the Red Man. Anthropologists know that acculturation proceeds in both directions when two societies are in any kind of contact and that even a conquered people help to shape the destiny of their overloads. "North Americans have maintained the European level with the strictest possible puritanism," wrote psychiatrist Carl Jung, "yet they could not prevent the souls of their Indian enemies from becoming theirs."[82] For our own benefit, let us resurrect some lost truth.

Indians picked the sites now occupied by many of our great cities and plotted the trails and canoe portages which are followed to this day by our highways, railroads, and canals.[83] Americans have copied their dress and not only in the fringed buckskin of Daniel Boone. From the Indians, Americans learned to substitute long pants for knee breeches; American women borrowed their feathers and paint, and to wear their moccasins, their parkas and ponchos.[84] Their beads and bells are popular with hippies. Americans learned to smoke their tobacco and eat their food; the tapioca of the Amazon, the beans, avocados, pineapples, chocolate, peppers, and cranberries, squashes and pecans of North America. The pemmican of the Plains Indians has served as food for antartic explorers. From the Mexican Indians, Americans borrowed chewing gum, tamales, chili and tortillas, from North American Indians, hominy, succotash, corn pone and popcorn.[85]

Literature, Music & Arts

American Indians have influenced Americans' literature far beyond Cooper's Mohicans and Longfellow's Hiawatha which is the alleged national truest epic. Edna Ferber, Hamlin Garland, Helen Hunt Jackson and Oliver La Farge are a few among many who have portrayed the Indian in novels. Thomas Wolfe and Ernest Hemingway used Indian themes in short stories, while Philip Freneau, John Neihardt, Lew Sarett and Walt Whitman glorified them in poetry.[86] Indian mythology constitutes America's most authentic American folklore. Appropriately, the first Bible printed in this country was in an Algonquian language, John Eliot's Indian Bible of 1663.

Indians have influenced composers of music; among those indebted to them are: Charles Wakefield

Cadman, Anton Dvorak, Anton P. Heinrich, Victor Herbert, Thrulow Lieurance, Harvey W. Loomis, Edward A. McDonwell and Charles S. Skilton.[87]

Indian arts and designs have influenced America's arts; jewelry, home decorations, and architecture.[88] Not only did early settlers initiate the Indian wigwam and palisade, but the army modified the Plains tepee into the Sibley tent. Today a prefabricated vacation home in the shape of a tepee, called Wigwam 70[89] has been marketed by the National Design Center in Chicago. The Quenset hut, which is widely used where simplicity is demanded, has both an Indian name and Indian design. Buckminster Fuller's "Geodesic Dome" is an aboriginal wigwam covered with metal or glass instead of bark. Modern skyscrapers copy the terraced setback of the Maya. Pueblos Adobe bricks became the white man's building material in the Southwest. The cube style of the pueblos appears in the La Fonda Hotel in Santa Fe and Moshe Safdie's Habitat at Expo '67 in Montreal. Willard Carl Kruger's New Mexico State House is in the shape of the Zia Sum Symbol. Frank Lloyd Wright acknowledged his debt to the Maya and incorporated their themes in some of his buildings. Of their temples, he wrote: "A grandeau arose in the scale of total building never since excelled, seldom equalled by man either in truth of plan or simple integrity of form."[90]

Not only was the Indian a sculptor, but he has inspired American sculptors as well. Leonard Crunelle, Malvin Hoffman, Ivan Mestrovic and Lorado Taft are among those who have portrayed the Indian in stone and bronze.[91] "Let us not forget that authentic American creation--the cigar store window Indian!" Among painters who made their reputation with Indian subjects are: Carl Bodmer, George Catlin, Frederick Rooington, and Alfred Miller.

Americans borrowed Indian inventions and even used their names for many of them; canoe, kayak, Piroque, cigar, hammock, and toboggan. Americans use the Indian's snowshoes, cradleboard, rubber, pipe, and cigarettes. Some of the American youth play lacrosse and other games which evolved from Indian sports.[92] Indian lore enlivens the program of youth organizations. Indian dance clubs and craft groups composed of white adults are flourishing in the U.S. and in Europe.[93] Indian themes are in the children's toys and juvenile literature. Indians have long been important in the movies, as they were earlier on the stage,[94] but it has only been recently that they have been portrayed on the screen with sympathy and dignity, in films like Broken Arrow, Devil's Doorway and Cheyenne Autumn.

Names & Languages

Indian people have enriched the language of Americans. Their words are used for animals: caribou, chipmunk, cougar, coyote, jaguar, manatee, moose, oppossum, racoon, skunk, and woodchuck. Trees carry their names: catalpa, chinquapin, hickory, papaw, pecan, persimmon, Sequois, Tamarack and Tupelo. Some sixty plants have Indian words used to name them including cohosh, puccoon, pipsisseaw and poke. Because of fancy or Indian usage, other words have been used like Indian paint brush, Indian pipe, Indian turnip, moccasin flower, papoose root, and squaw vine. Americans use their words for topographic features such as muskegs, bayous, and savannas, and speak of hurricanes and chinook winds. Red man taught Americans to say hooch, okay, punk, and pewee. From them came borrowed terms such as caucus, tammany, pow-wow, mugwump, podunk, and tuxedo. Other commonly used words or phrases, like "Buck," "bury the hatchet," "go on the warpath," "Indian Summer," "Indian giver," "Indian File," "great white Father," and "war paint,"[95] have connections to the Red Man.

Americans plant Cherokee roses, Catawha grapes, Pima cotton, and Black Hawk raspberries. Americans drive Pontiac and Cherokee Chief cars, ride in trains called "The Chief" and "Hiawatha." Americans call their athletic teams: Black Hawks, Braves, Illini, Redskins, Warriors, and Indians. There are Cayuse and Appaloosa ponies and Malemute dogs.

Indian words have been used to name twenty-seven States, four great lakes, and many mountains and rivers, to give as Menchen said, "A barbaric brilliancy to the American map."[96] Canada and four of its provinces and two of its territories have Indian names, as do ten nations in Latin America. Indian words were used to name cities like: Chattanooga, Chicago, Kalamazoo, Kenocha, Keokuk, Kokomo, Mankato, Miami, Milwaukee, Muncie, Muskegon, Omaha, Oshkosh, Paducah, Pawtucket, Peoria, Sandusky, Schenectady, Seattle, Sheboygan, Spokane, Tacoma, Tallahassee, Tucson, Tulsa, Waco, and Wichita. Some of their names were translated into colorful English and French equivalents like Bad Axe, Battle Creek, Des Plaines, and Fond du Lac.

Indians brighten the advertising field. Totem Poles invite you to Alaska and the Indian calendar store calls one to Mexico. Indians are featured in the advertising of the Santa Fe and Great Northern Railroads, and in the tourist advertising of many States. The Indian is on the baking soda can, on a box of corn starch, on chewing tobacco, patent medicines, and many other products. Indian names are used as trade marks: Black Hawk meats, Cherokee garment, Pequot sheets, Sioux tools, Wyandotte Chemicals and Navajo truck lines. The Indian is on coins and stamps. An aztec legend is pictured on the Mexican Flag and Indian symbols decorate the State Flag of New Mexico and Oklahoma.

The Indian & Political History

The Indian is an important ingredient of America's political history. The colonial charters speak of Trade and Conversion as objects of the colonizers. The Indian presence was a spur to efforts at Colonial Union, from the New England Confederation to the Albany Congress. The Iroquois Alliance helped to defeat the French and Indians were significant participants in all colonial wars, and later ones, both as friends and foes. Their rebellion under Pontiac in 1763 won the royal proclamation choosing the West to settlement, and launched a chain of events leading to America's independence. Indians are mentioned in the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, the Northwest Ordinance, the U.S. Constitution, the Constitution of the Confederacy, and in numerous presidential messages and party platforms. Indians are on record with having at least five treaties with foreign powers,[97] have 372 treaties with the U.S., and over 4,000 laws have been passed pertaining to the Indians. Several government agencies are involved with the Indians.

Montaigne, Rousseau, and Jefferson paid tribute to the Indian capacity to organize human affairs in the libertarian manner. The Iroquois developed a system of confederated government which, according to Benjamin Franklin served as an example for his Albany Plan of Union,[98] and eventually for the Articles of Confederation. Felix Cohen has lashed the assumption that our democracy was born in Greece: ...it is out of a rich Indian democratic tradition that the distinctive political ideals of American life emerged. Universal suffrage for women as for men, the pattern of States within a State that we call federalism, the habit of treating chiefs as servants of the people instead of their masters, the insistence that the community must respect the diversity of men and the diversity of their dreams--all these things were part of the American way of life before Columbus landed.[99]

The followers of Sam Adams masqueraded as Indians at the Boston Tea Party and Americans borrowed Indian military tactics in the revolution, as the poet Robert P. Tristom Coffin has written:

> "We bent down to the bobcat's crouch
> Took color from the butternut tree,
> at Saratoga, Lexington,
> We fought like Indians and went free."

Even customs and folkways: frontier hospitality, and a neighborly cooperation, such as barn-raising, were copies of Indian manners. We learned his weather and plant lore. His war whoop was the "rebel yell" in the Civil War and Tristom Coffin says,:

> "We even put the Pow-Wow on,
> We dance the night before we fight,
> Republicans, Democrats, football teams
> With red hot songs build up their night."[100]

The predominant ethnic strain in all but four of the nations of Central and South America is Indian. Indians have shaped the study of anthropology, linguistics, and archaeology, particularly in America, and have contributed to thought in psychology, sociology, law, political theory, and education. They taught Americans progressive, non-authoritarian ways of rearing and teaching children.[101]

Cultural Challenge & Individual Response

It is a trap to measure the worth of any people by the degree to which they have successfully participated as individuals in a rival culture. Because Indians are few in number and lived a largely separate life, they cannot point to a large number of such persons. In athletics, however, fame came to Jim Thorpe, Louis Tewomiom, Don Eagle and Charles Albert Bonder. In military service, there are Brig. Gen. Eli S. Parker (who wrote the surrender to Appomattox), Major Gen. Clarence Tinker, and Rear Admiral Joseph Clark. Indians can point with pride to artists Brummet Echohawk and Beation Yazz, ballerinas Marie and Marjorie Tallchief, humorist Will Rogers, actor Jay Silverheels, William Keeler, President and Board Chairman Phillips Petroleum Corporation, former Vice President Charles Curtis and numerous other people.[102]

The tragedy, if one were to find tragedy, is that nowhere can we find a history book that tells more than a small fragment of these things.

Housing

Excerpt From American Indian Policy Review Commission Report

Housing problems for Indian families and individuals begin immediately upon leaving reservation and rural communities. These problems are basically generated by a critical lack of adequate housing in the rural communities Indians leave, a general lack of prior experience or knowledge of related domestic activities (e.g. renting, leasing, etc.) which are matters of course for most individuals. Advice about housing, leasing, search and other fundamentals to relocating are not readily available since most family and friends living in rural areas are also ignorant of urban living situations. Lacking orientation and proper preparation for finding adequate housing, each family must learn by experience--a situation that proves to be costly and more often than not for the low income families, resulting in less than adequate living conditions.

Reports and testimonies point out that it is not unusual for Indian families to arrive in cities with little or no funds to spend on housing. Because of discriminatory practices of landlords[103] large family composition,[104] low incomes and a general lack of information about housing alternatives, Indians all too frequently find themselves in substandard and cramped living quarters.

Housing, Sanitation Data for Urban and Rural Indians[105]

	Urban		*Rural*	
	U.S.	*Indians*	*U.S.*	*Indians*
Housing - Degree of Crowding: (Persons/Room)				
1.00 or less	92.5%	81.3%	89.9%	55.0%
1.01 to 1.50	5.7	12.2	7.1	15.4
1.51 or more (Severe)	1.9	6.4	3.0	28.6
Sanitation Facilities:				
Without Water	0.3	0.9	8.7	67.4
Without Toilet	0.6	8.6	13.6	48.0

NOTE: This table reveals that Indians have greater tendencies to live in overcrowded conditions both in rural and urban areas. In addition, there is a greater tendency for both groups to settle for housing without adequate sanitation facilities. Notably, the presence of such basic deficiencies in housing is far from tolerable for urban living.

Family Characteristics of the U.S. Total & American Indian Populations, 1970[106]

	U.S. Total	*Total Indian*	*Urban Indian*	*Rural Indian*
% Husband-Wife Families	86%	77%	77%	77%
% With Children Under 18	56	67	64	70
$ With Children Under 6	27	40	38	41
% Persons Under 18 Living With Both Parents	85	69	67	70
% Female-Headed Families	11	18	19	18
% With Children Under 18	55	66	70	61
% With Children Under 6	21	32	33	30
% Families With 3 Or More Own Children Under 18	20	33	27	38
% Families With 5 Or More Persons	25	41	32	50

NOTE: This table reveals that greater percentages of Indian families have children under ages 18, and children under six years of age. The chart also shows that greater percentages of Indians have families with five or more persons. (Note the high percentage of urban Indian female heads of household.)

Family Composition: Summary 1970[107]

	Nuclear Families	*Extended Families*		
	Total	*Total*	*3-4 generation linear family, including grand children or parents of head*	*Families with only relatives other than grandchildren or parents of head (brothers, sisters, etc.)*
U.S. Total	88%	12%	7%	5%
Indians	78	22	13	9
Urban	83	17	9	8
Rural	74	26	17	9

In addition, many Indian families must forego essential expenditures on utilities or on the purchase of basic furniture requirements until they feel they can afford them or until they are able to establish credit. It must be emphasized that all these problems and others occur at a most crucial period, when the head of the household is in the process of seeking employment.

When Indian families succeed in finding housing, particularly when it is located in better neighborhoods, they are often coerced into signing long-term leasing agreements which they may not understand, or are told binds them into making costly repairs on property they do not own or that are not within their legal obligations to repair. For lack of legal services and vital information about housing codes, there are few means whereby the Indian family can be assured that such practices do not occur.

Bias and discrimination also inhibit the choice and selection of desirable housing. If housing markets are tight, the family must often settle for what is available. As a result the Indian family may be willing to accept sub-standard housing in marginal neighborhoods where there are high concentrations of poverty. The result is that Indian families are left to learn urban adjustment in areas of high crime, poor sanitation, and cramped living conditions. The extent of these problems may cause many individuals to consider that perhaps, they were better off living in their rural community.

Without doubt, this initial period of urban living is one of great confusion and dependency for Indians. In presence of few other sources of support, the Indian often turns to other members of his family for moral and financial assistance, thus placing additional burden on other families in similar predicaments. Should individuals or entire families move in with other members of an immediate or extended family to lower expenses, etc., the situation is worsened by overcrowding,[108] landlord harassment, and unhealthy living conditions.[109] When all urban family support breaks down, it is not uncommon for the Indian to return to his particular rural community, only to venture back later, after resources there as well, become depleted. Frequent migration to and from urban and rural Indian communities, a number of urban Indian center coordinators state, have notably complicated statistical gathering processes and the formation of an adequate urban Indian needs assessment.

Indian and non-Indian agencies attempting to service the urban Indian find it especially difficult to include this fluid population as part of permanent population bases when seeking to justify what they consider to be appropriate Indian shares of community chest and foundation funds for program services to meet the needs of this portion of the urban Indian population.

The transitory nature of a substantial portion of urban Indian populations to and from reservations, and more recently identified trend, to and from other urban Indian communities, are a significant characteristic of a visible portion of the urban Indian community. Without a doubt it carries with it, substantial financial and emotional burdens. Perhaps even more crucial, it inhibits unifying efforts to overcome a series of related problems. Where unifying efforts have occurred, however, and small inner-city organizations have developed, Indian groups have been able to generate interest in improving housing conditions. Utilizing various types of political support and thrust some groups have begun to assess housing needs, identify housing problems and implement orientation/ education programs in Indian communities.

Programs which make available housing education, orientation, listing of rentals, leasing information, and offer advice, provide a necessary first step in relieving some initial problems of housing facing newly migrated Indian families. Such programs could be expanded to include activities that provide information regarding direct supplemental grants for housing, loans, housing improvements and rent supplements during the family's initial tenure in cities.

Concurrent programs could also enlist the interest of the non-Indian members of the urban communities such that they are made acutely aware of their responsibilities towards Indian people, as members of the urban community in assuring that Indian people receive standard housing at fair prices.

Other efforts to stablize economic and social conditions consequently provide incentive for the development of Indian family roles in urban settings, are in order. Education projects regarding credit application procedures, advice on managing economic conditions and the identification and/or development of fiscally responsible credit mechanisms for Indian people, are additional areas of need.

Findings

1. Upon arrival to urban areas, most Indians are not adequately informed about how to find housing.

2. Already at a disadvantage because of lack of money, the Indian family will often settle in inadequate housing located in distressful neighborhoods.

3. Lack of funds will also cause many families to forego basic necessities, and those conveniences vital for seeking employment. (Adequate/ reliable transportation, telephones, utilities.)

4. In addition, the Indian family, larger than average U.S. families tend to share housing with relatives to save expenses.

5. Existing agencies designed to service housing problems, know little about Indian housing problems or the Indian situation as a whole, as a consequence, they find it difficult to assist the Indian family individually.

131

Indian Population by Regions

(1970 Census Statistics)

Dallas Region: 25%

State	1960 Pop.	1970 Pop.	% of Increase	Projected 1980 Pop.
Arkansas	580	2,014	247%	
Louisiana	3,587	5,294	48%	
New Mexico	56,255	72,788	29%	
Oklahoma	64,689	98,468	52%	
Texas	5,750	17,957	212%	
Total	130,861	196,521	50%	294,782

San Francisco Region: 25%

State	1960 Pop.	1970 Pop.	% of Increase	Projected 1980 Pop.
Arizona	83,337	95,812	15%	
California	39,014	91,018	133%	
Hawaii	472	1,112	136%	
Nevada	6,681	7,833	17%	
Total	129,504	195,775	51%	295,620

Denver Region: 13%

State	1960 Pop.	1970 Pop.	% of Increase	Projected 1980 Pop.
Colorado	4,288	8,836	106%	
Montana	21,181	27,130	28%	
N. Dakota	11,736	14,369	22%	
S. Dakota	25,794	32,365	25%	
Utah	6.961	11,273	62%	
Wyoming	4,020	4,980	24%	
Total	73,980	98,953	34%	132,597

Chicago Region: 10%

State	1960 Pop.	1970 Pop.	% of Increase	Projected 1980 Pop.
Illinois	4,704	11,413	143%	
Indiana	948	3,887	310%	
Michigan	9,701	16,854	74%	
Minnesota	15,496	23,128	49%	
Ohio	1,910	6,654	248%	
Wisconsin	14,297	18,924	32%	
Total	47,056	80,860	72%	139,079

Seattle Region: 9%

State	1960 Pop.	1970 Pop.	% of Increase	Projected 1980 Pop.
Alaska	14,444	16,276	13%	
Idaho	5,231	6,687	28%	
Oregon	8,026	13,510	68%	
Washington	21,076	33,386	58%	
Total	48,777	69,859	43%	99,898

Atlanta Region: 8%

State	1960 Pop.	1970 Pop.	% of Increase	Projected 1980 Pop.
Alabama	1,276	2,443	91%	
Florida	2,505	6,677	167%	
Georgia	749	2,347	213%	
Kentucky	391	1,531	292%	
Mississippi	3,119	4,113	32%	
N. Carolina	38,129	44,406	16%	
S. Carolina	1,098	2,241	104%	
Tennessee	638	2,276	257%	
Total	47,905	66,034	38%	91,127

New York Region: 4%

State	1960 Pop.	1970 Pop.	% of Increase	Projected 1980 Pop.
New Jersey	1,699	4,706	177%	
New York	16,491	28,355	72%	
Puerto Rico	0	0	0%	
Virgin Islands	0	0	0%	
Total	18,190	33,061	82%	60,171

St.Louis Region: 3%

State	1960 Pop.	1970 Pop.	% of Increase	Projected 1980 Pop.
Iowa	1,708	2,992	75%	
Kansas		8,261		
Missouri	1,723	5,405	214%	
Nebraska	5,545	6,624	19%	
Total	8,976	23,282	159%	60,300

Philadelphia Region: 2%

State	1960 Pop.	1970 Pop.	% of Increase	Projected 1980 Pop.
Delaware	597	656	10%	
Maryland	1,538	4,239	176%	
Pennsylvania	2,122	5,533	161%	
Virginia	2.155	4,853	125%	
W. Virginia	181	751	315%	
Total	6,593	16,032	143%	38,958

Boston Region: 1%

State	1960 Pop.	1970 Pop.	% of Increase	Projected 1980 Pop.
Connecticut	923	2,222	141%	
Maine	1,879	2,195	17%	
Massachusetts	2,118	4,475	111%	
New Hampshire	135	361	167%	
Rhode Island	932	1,390	49%	
Vermont	57	229	302%	
Total	6,044	10,872	80%	19,570

	1960 Pop.	1970 Pop.	% of Increase	Projected 1980 Pop.
Total U.S.	517,886	791,249	53%	1,210,611

Mr. Rodney P. Arnett, Chief
Peoria Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 1308
Miami, OK 74354

Mr. Lewis Barlow, Chief
Otawa Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 1308
Miami, OK 74354

Mr. Bill Follis, Chief
Modoc Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 1308
Miami, OK 74354

Tri-Tribal Office
811 3rd Avenue
Miami, OK 74354

Mr. Bruce M. Townsend, Chairman
Delaware Tribe of Eastern Oklahoma
201 Denver Building
Tulsa, OK 74119

Mr. Overton James, Governor
Chickasaw Nation of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 1548
Ada, OK 78420

Mr. Hollis E. Roberts, Principal Chief
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma
Drawer 1201
Durant, OK 74701

Mr. James H. Allen, Chief
Seneca-Cayuaga Business Comm.
P.O. Box 1283
Miami, OK 74354

Mr. George J. "Buck" Captain, Chief
Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma
308 Robinson Building
Miami, OK 74354

Mr. Mont Cotter, Chief
Wyadotle Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 636-309 N. Main
Miami, Ok 74354

Mr. Claude A. Cox, Principal Chief
Creek Nation of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 1114
Okmulgee, OK 74447

Mr. Sylvester J. Tinker, Principal Chief
Osage Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 1346
Pawhuska, OK 74056

Mr. Jess McKibben, Chairman
Quapaw Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 765
Quapaw, OK 74363

Mr. Ross O. Swimmer, Principal Chief
Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 948
Tahlequah, OK 74464

Mr. Jerome Shawnee, Chairman of Bus. Comm.
Cherokee-Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma
4957 N. St. Louis
Tulsa, OK 74126

Mr. Tom Palmer, Principal Chief
Seminole Nation of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 745
Wewoka, OK 74884

Mr. Lawrence Snake, President
Delaware Tribe of Western Oklahoma
P.O. Box 825
Anadarko, OK 73005

Mr. Doyle Edge, Chairman
Caddo Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 855
115 NE First
Anadarko, OK 73005

Ms. Joyce Bell, President
Wichita Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 729
Anadarko, OK 73005

Mr. Housten Klinekole, Chairman
Apache Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 733
Anadarko, OK 73005

Mr. Lawrence Murray, Chairman
Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 99
Perkins, OK 74059

p. 130 deleted-nonreproducible map

Mr. Duane Pratt, Chairman
of the Bus. Council
Pawnee Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 67
Pawnee, OK 74055

Mr. Jacob Ahtone, Chairman
Kiowa Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 1028
Anadarko, OK 73005

Ms. Mildred I. Cleghorn,
Chairperson
Ft. Sill Apache Tribe
115 NE First
Anadarko, OK 73005

Mr. Joseph Pedro, Chairman
Cheyenne/Arapaho Tribes of
Oklahoma
P.O. Box 38
Concho, OK 73022

Mr. James M. Cox, Chairman
Comanche Indian Tribe
P.O. Box 72
Lawton, OK 73501

Mr. Jessie Mehejah, Jr.,
Chairman
KAW Business Committee
P.O. Box 710
515 S. Pine
Ponca City, OK 74601

Mr. Leonard Biggoose,
Chairman
Ponca Tribe of Oklahoma
Box 1, White Eagle
Ponca City, OK 74601

Mr. Kenneth Harragarra,
Chairman
Otoe-Missouri Tribes of
Oklahoma
P.O. Box 68
Red Rock, OK 74651

Mr. Paul Schmidlkofer,
Chairman
Citizen Band Potawatomi of
Oklahoma
Rt. 5, Box 151
Shawnee, OK 74801

Mr. Elmer H. Grant,
Principal Chief
SAC & Fox Tribe of Oklahoma
Rt. 2, Box 246
Stroud, OK 74801

Mr. John L. Sloat, Governor
Absentee/Shawnee Tribes of
Oklahoma
P.O. Box 1747
Shawnee, OK 74801

Mr. Henry L. Allen,
President
Tonkawa Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 70
Tonkawa, OK 74653

Mr. Herbert White, Chairman
Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 58
McLoud, OK 74851

United Indian Tribes of
Western Oklahoma &
Kansas, Inc.
P.O. Box 1382
Shawnee, OK 74801

Ms. Iola Hayden, Executive
Director
Oklahomans for Indian
Opportunity, Inc.
333 Constitution
Norman, OK 73069

Mr. Bob Gann, Executive
Director
Oklahoma Indian Affairs
Commission
4010 Lincoln Blvd.
Oklahoma City, OK 73105

Director
Five Tribes Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box A-F
Muskogee, OK 74401

Ms. Millie Giago, Director
Native American Center, Inc.
1214 N. Hudson
Oklahoma City, OK 73103

Mr. Les Cusher, Executive
Director
NE Oklahoma Inter-Tribal
Council, Inc.
P.O. Box 1308
Miami, OK 74354

Mr. Clifford W. Kilpatrick,
Director
Central Tribes of Shawnee,
Inc.
P.O. Box 2427, University
Station
Shawnee, OK 74801

Tulsa Indian Youth Council, Inc.
716 S. Troost
Tulsa, OK 74107

Mr. John Daughtery, Director
Native American Coalition of Tulsa, Inc.
P.O. Box 2646
819 S. Denver
Tulsa, OK 74119

Director
W.C.D. (Ink) Enterprises, Inc.
P.O. Box 998
Anadarko, OK 73005

Mr. Walt Broemer, Executive Director
Texas Indian Commission
1011 Alston
Livingston, TX 75206

Mr. Mike Mahsetky, Chairman
Board of Directors
American Indian Center, Inc.
1314 N. Munger
Dallas, TX 75206

Mr. Ray Johnson, Chairman
Board of Directors
Dallas Inter-Tribal Center, Inc.
334 Centre
Dallas, TX 75208

Mr. Emmett Battise, Supt.
Alabama-Coushatta Tribe
Rt. 3, Box 640
Livingston, TX 77351

Mr. Joseph L. Juancho, Supt.
Tigua Indian Community
P.O. Box 17579-Ysleta Station
El Paso, TX 79917

Mr. Ray Concho, Governor
ACOMA Pueblo
P.O. Box 309
Acomita, NM 87034

Mr. Juan Valencia, Governor
San Felipe Pueblo
P.O. Box 308
Algodones, NM 87001

Ms. Inez Baca
Sandia Pueblo
P.O. Box 608
Bernalillo, NM 87004

Mr. Sam Armijo, Governor
Santa Ana Pueblo
P.O. Box 37
Bernalillo, NM 87004

Mr. Isaac Herrera, Governor
Cochiti Pueblo
P.O. Box 70
Cochiti Pueblo, NM 87041

Mr. Walter Dasheno, Governor
Santa Clara Pueblo
P.O. Box 580
Espanola, NM 87532

Mr. Alvino Lucero, Governor
Isleta Pueblo
P.O. Box 317
Isleta Pueblo, NM 87022

Mr. Frank Loretta, Governor
Jemez Pueblo
P.O. Box 78
Jemez Pueblo, NM 87024

Mr. Floyd Correa, Governor
Laguna Pueblo
P.O. Box 194
Old Laguna, NM 87026

Mr. Victor Martinez, Governor
Picuris Pueblo
P.O. Box 228
Penasco, NM 87553

Mr. Andrew Garcia, Governor
San Juan Pueblo
P.O. Box 1099
San Juan, NM 87566

Mr. Moses Shije, Governor
Zia Pueblo
General Delivery
San Ysidro, NM 87053

Mr. Pete Concha, Governor
Taos Pueblo
P.O. Box 1846
Taos Pueblo, NM 87571

Mr. Robert Lewis, Governor
Zuni Pueblo
P.O. Box 338
Zuni, NM 87327

Mr. Ben J. Cuho, President
Ramah Navajo
P.O. BOx 267
Ramah, NM 87321

Mr. Wendell Chino,
President
Mescalero Apache Tribe
P.O. Box 176
Mescalero, NM 88340

Mr. Joe A. Padilla,
Governor
Tesuque Pueblo
Rt. 1-Box 1
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Mr. Jacob Viarrial,
Governor
Pojoaque Pueblo
Rt. 1, Box 71
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Mr. Gilbert M. Pena,
Governor
Nambe Pueblo
Rt. 1, Box 117-BB
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Mr. Dennis Martinez,
Governor
San Ildefanso Pueblo
Rt. 5, Box 315-A
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Mr. Alex Garcia, Governor
Santa Domingo Pueblo
General Delivery
Santo Domingo Pueblo, NM
87052

Mr. Leonard Atole,
President
Jicarilla Apache Tribal
Council
P.O. Box 507
Dulce, NM 87528

Mr. Joe Herrera, Executive
Director
New Mexico Commission on
Indian Affairs
Bataan Memorial Building
Santa Fe, NM 87503

Mr. Herman Agoyo, Executive
Director
Eight Northern Indian
Pueblos Council
P.O. Box 969
San Juan Pueblo, NM 87566

Mr. Delfin Lovato, Chairman
All Indian Pueblo Council,
Inc.
P.O. Box 6507, Station B
Albuquerque, NM 87107

Six Sandovol Indian Pueblo
P.O. Box 580
Bernalillo, NM 87004

Mr. Gerald Wilkionson,
Executive Director
National Indian Youth
Council, Inc.
201 Hermosa Dr., NE
Albuquerque, NM 87108

Ms. Ladonna Harris,
President
Americans for Indian
Opportunity
6000 Second, NW
Albuquerque, NM 87105

Mr. Don Benally, President
Farmington Inter-tribal
Indian Organization
P.O. Box 2322
Farmington, NM 87401

Mr. L. M. Burgess, Chairman
Chitimacha Tribe of
Louisiana
P.O. Box 661
Charenton, LA 70523

Mr. Ernest Sickey, Chairman
Coushatta Tribe of
Louisiana
P.O. Box 988
Elton, LA 70532

Ms. Helen Gindrat, Chairman
Homa Tribe of Louisiana
Star Rt., Box 958
Golden Meadow, LA 70357

Mr. Howard Dion, Chairman
Homa Alliance, Inc.
Rt. 6, Box 88B
Homa, LA 70360

Mr. Joe Pierite, Chairman
Tunca-Biloxi Tribe of
Louisiana
P.O. Box 101
Marksville, LA 71351

Mr. Norris Tyler, Chairman
Clifton Choctaw Community
Rt. 1, Box 37
Mora, LA 71371

Mr. Clyde Jackson, Chairman
Jena Band of Choctaws
P.O. Box 212
Trout, LA 71371

Mr. Peter D. Mora III
Office of Indian Affairs
Dept. of Urban & Community
Affairs
P.O. Box 44455-Capitol
Station
Baton Rouge, LA 70804

Mr. Ernest Sickey, Chairman
Inter-Tribal Council of
Louisiana, Inc.
263 Riverside Mall, Suite
208
Baton Rouge, LA 70801

Footnotes

[1] *Felix Cohen's Handbook of Federal Indian Law*, 1945, listed the existence of 4,264 separate statutes having application to American Indians.

[2] *See Worcester v. Georgia*, 31 U.S. 350 (1832).

[3] Art. II, Sec. 2, Cl. 2: "(The President) shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties...."

[4] Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3: "Congress shall have power...to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes...."

[5] See *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, 30 U.S. 1 (1831); *United States v. Kagama*, 118 U.S. 375, 383-84 (1886).

[6] See comment, the Indian Battle for Self Determination, 58 Cal. L.R. 445 (1970).

[7] 31 U.S. 350 (1832).

[8] 16 stat. 566, 25 U.S.C. 71.

[9] See cases cited in notes 3, 4, and 5, *Federal Indian Law*, *supra*, p. 25.

[10] 316 U.S. 286 (1942).

[11] 41 Am. Jur. 2d, § 11, p. 840.

[12] *Ke-Tuc-e-mun-guah v. McClure*, 122 Ind. 541, 23 N.E. 1080 (1890).

[13] *Federal Indian Law*, *supra*, p. 469.

[14] *Supra* at page 379.

[15] 180 U.S. 261 (1901).

[16] 231 F. 2d 89, 92 (1956).

[17] *Federal Indian Law* (1940 ed.) p. 123.

[18] *Federal Indian Law*, *supra*, p. 395.

[19] *Federal Indian Law*, *supra*, p. 396.

[20] *Ibid*, at 403.

[21] See Act of June 7, 1897, 30 stat. 62, 84.

[22] See *Colliflower v. Garland*, 342 F. 2d 369 (1965).

[23] *Little v. Nakai*, 344 F. 2d 486, *cert. den.* 382 U.S. 986 (1965).

[24] *Williams v. Lee*, 358 U.S. 217 (1958).

[25] *Colliflower v. Garland*, supra.

[26] *Native American Church v. Navajo Tribal Council*, 272 F. 2d 131 (1959).

[27] 41 Am. Jur. 2d, § 66, p. 869.

[28] 25 U.S.C. 1301, 35. seq.

[29] 18 U.S.C. 1153.

[30] 28 U.S.C. 1360.

[31] *Pioneer Packing Company v. Winslow*, 159 Wash. 655, 294, p. 557.

[32] *Puyallup Tribe v. Department of Game*, 391 U.S. 392 (1970).

[33] *Marris v. Sockey*, 170 F. 2d (1948).

[34] See Note, 13 Yale L.J. 250 (1904).

[35] 135 F. 947 (1905).

[36] *Morris v. Hitchcock*, 21 app. D.C. 565 (1903).

[37] *Acosta v. San Diego County*, 126 Cal. app. 2d 455, 272 p. 2d 92; *Deere v. New York* (D.C. N.Y.) 22 F. 2d 851 (1927).

[38] *Smith v. United States*, 151 U.S. 50, 38 (1894)

[39] *Halbert v. United States*, 283 U.S. 753, 762-763 (1931).

[40] 163 U.S. 376 (1896).

[41] 219 F. Supp. 19, 21 (1963).

[42] 272 F. 2d 131, 10th Cir. (1959).

[43] *Toledo v. Pueblo De Jemez*, 119 F. Supp. 429 (D.M. Mex. (1954)).

[44] 272 F. 2d 131 (1962).

[45] 272 F. 131, p. 135.

[46] Public Law 90-284; 25 U.S.C. 1301, et. seq.

[47] *Piper v. Big Pines School District*, 193 Cal. 664, 226 pac. 926 (1924).

[48] See memorandum, Solicitor for the Department of Interior, April 22, 1936, holding that the Social Security Act was applicable to Indians.

[49] Although originally true, this has not been the case for decades.

[50] United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, May 1968.

[51] *In Re Celestine*, 114 Sed. 551 (1902).

[52] The Commission members were Senator James Abourezk, Chairman (Dem.--S. Dak.); Congressman Lloyd Meeds, Vice Chairman (Dem--Wash.); Senator Lee Metcalk (Dem.--Mont.); Senator Mark Hatfield (Rep.--Ore.); Congressman Sidney Yates (Dem.--Ill.); Congressman Sam Steiger (Rep.--Ariz.); Ada Deer (Menominee); Jake Whitecrow (Quapaw--Seneca--Cayuga); John Brobridge (Tlinget); Louis R. Bruce (Mohawk--Sioux); and Dr. Adolph A. Dial (Lumbee).

[53] "A Study of Selected Socio-Economic Characteristics of Ethnic Minorities Based on the 1970 Census. Vol. III: American Indians." Office of Special Concerns, Office of the Assistant Sec. for Planning and Evaluation, Dept. of H.E.W. (1974). (pp. 49-57)

[54] Responses from 62 organizational questionnaires regarding the needs of urban Indian communities revealed employment needs were the most frequently expressed and that respondents characteristically mentioned this before any other.

[55] Ibid. H.E.W. Report (p. 51)

[56] Ibid. H.E.W. Report pp. 49-53

[57] Common questions asked on employment forms can be particularly difficult for traditional Indian persons to answer without extensive explanation. Example follows:

Name	It is not unusual for this to change with various situations. 1) Non-Indians may not be able to pronounce the name, so it is changed to one easily pronounced. 2) A name may not have been given consistently to same members of a family--a result of students attending different off-reservation school systems. 3) It is not unusual for persons to simply change a name--perhaps remnants of a cultural attitude about names etc.
Address	Many Indians consider their "real" home the reservation and urban areas are merely temporary residences.
Telephone	Cannot afford. Same problems associated with address.
Birthdate/Age	Many reservation born persons were born at home. Parents, unfamiliar with dates have allowed many traditional persons in fact, to choose their own birthdate. With the same ease, one could forget or change the date, month or even the year.

[58] Urban Indians, in particular, show notable strides. But the figures, when interpreted, reveal that a substantial number of individuals included in the urban high educational attainment count may well be those who migrated to urban communities from rural areas. Comparatively similar enrollment figures between the two groups add significance to such a theory.

[59] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *1970 Census of Population: Detailed Characteristics, United States Summary*, PC(1)-D1 *Subject Reports: American Indians*, PC(2)-1F

[60] HEW Report. Ibid. p. 62 "The disparity between need for and availability of an adequate income for female households is an important issue for Indians, particularly in light of the increase of this type of household in their population."

[61] Ibid., P. 47

[62] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *1970 Census of Population, General Social and Economic Characteristics, United States Summary*, PC(1)-C1: *Detailed Characteristics, United States Summary*, PC(1)-D1; *Subject Reports: American Indians*, PC(2)-1F.

[63] Omaha testimony.

[64] Problems associated with this migratory pattern will be discussed in the Housing section of this report.

[65] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *1970 Census of Population, General Social and Economic Characteristics, United States Summary*, PC(1)-C1; *Detailed Characteristics, United States Summary*, PC(1)-D1; *Subject Reports: American Indians*, PC(2)-1F.

[66] Dept. H.E.W. *A Study of Selected Socio-Economic Characteristics of Ethnic Minorities Based on the 1970 Census* Vol. III, American Indians p. 45

[67] Charles A. Hill, Jr., and Mozart I. Spector: "Natality and Mortality of American Indians Compared with U.S. Whites and Nonwhites," *HSMHA Reports*, Vol. 86, No. 3, March 1971.

[68] The Indian Health Program of the U.S. Public Health Service, HDEW Pub. No. (HSM) 73-12,003 August 1972.

[69] Otitis Media Program, Indian Health Service: Annual Report Fiscal Year 1972 (unpublished).

[70] To the First Americans: The Fourth Report on the Indian Health Program of the U.S. Public Health Service, PHS Pub. No. 1580, Revised 1970.

[71] Tony Casto: "Crisis of the Urban Indian," *Human Needs*, Vol. 1, No. 1, August 1972.

[72] William M. Moore, Marjorie M. Silverberg, Merrill S. Read: Nutrition, Growth and Development of North American Indian Children, DHEW Publication No. (NIH) 72-26 (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development) 1972.

[73] Orientation Manual, U.S. Public Health Service, Indian Health Service, The Office of Education, Clinton, Oklahoma, July 1971.

[74] Charles C. Bollinger, M.D., Thomas C. Carrier, M.D., William J. Ledger, M.D.: "Intrauterine Contraception in Indians of the American Southwest," *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, Vol. 106, No. 5, March 1, 1970.

[75] Joseph Abramowitz, D.D.S.: "Planning for the Indian Health Service," *Journal of Public Health Dentistry*, Vol. 31, No. 2, Spring 1971.

[76] J. David Baum, D.C.H.: "Nutritional Value of Human Milk," *Obstetrics and Gynecology*, Vol. 37, No. 1, January 1971.

[77] A. Rubenstein, J. Boyle, M.D., C.L. Odoroff, PhD., S.J. Kunitz, M.D.: "Effects of Improved Sanitary Facilities on Infant Diarrhea in a Hopi Village," *Public Health Reports*, Vol. 84, No. 12, December 1969.

[78] Abraham B. Bergman, M.D., C. George Ray, M.D., et al.: "Studies of Sudden Infant Death Syndrome in King County, Washington," *Pediatrics*, Vol. 49, No. 6, June 1972.

[79] Alice D. Chenoweth, M.D.: "Maternal and Child Health," February 1973 (unpublished).

[80] 1969 White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health: Final Report, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1970.

[81] See reports from Indian Health Task Force

[82] Jung, "Contributions to Analytical Psychology," NY Harcourt 1938, p. 139

[83] Archer B. Hulbent, "Indian Thoroughfares," Columbus, A.H. Clark Co., 1902

[84] "The forecast is for more and more Indian influence on fashion." Tony Minor Broadcast, WNUS, 1/27/68. The entire "Feminique" section of the Chicago Tribune, 10/2/67, devoted to Indian influence to fashions, jewelry and home decorations.

[85] A. Hyatt Verill & Otis W. Barrett, "Foods America Gave the World," Boston; C.C. Page & Co. 1937, Yeffe Kimball and Jean Anderson, "The Art of American Indian Cooking, Garden City, N.Y. Doubleday & Cul. 1965

[86] Albert Keiser, "The Indian in American Literature," N.Y. Oxford Univ. 1933

[87] Gilbert Chase, "America's Music," N.Y. McGraw/Hill 1955, Passim

[88] John Burchard & Albert Bush-Brown, "The Architecture of America," Boston, Little-Brown Co. 1961, pp. 57, 236, 351-5

[89] Tepee & Wigwam are the Dakota and Algonquin Terms, respectively, for the dwelling. In English, the first term properly belongs to the Skin or Canvas Tents of the Plains Tribes.

[90] Wright, "Writings & Buildings," N.Y. Meridian Books, 1960, p. 22

[91] Marian Gridley, "America's Indian Statues," Chicago, The Amerindian, 1966

[92] Allan A. MacFarlin, "Book of American Indian Games," N.Y. Association Press 1960.

[93] Robin Richman, "Rediscovery of the Redman," Life, 12/1/1967, p. 52-71

[94] Contance Rourke, "The Roots of American Culture," N.Y. Harcourt, Brace & Co. 1942, p. 60-74

[95] Mitford, Mathews, "Discovery of Americanism, 2 Vols, Chicago Univ. of Chicago 1951, I. 866-80. A.F. Chamberlian, "Memorials of the Indian," "Journal of American Folk-Lore, XV, No. 17, (April/June 1902), p. 107-16, iden. "Algonkian Words in American English," Ibid, XV, Vol. 19 (Oct/Dec) 1902 p. 240

[96] H.L. Mencken, "The American Language, N.Y. Alfred A. Knopf, 1947

[97] Jays' Treaty with Great Britain, 1794; Pinckney's Treaty with Spain, 1795, p. 528, Treaty of Ghent, 1814; Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo 1848, Alaska Purchase Treaty, 1867.

[98] "It would be a very strange thing if six nations of ignorant savages should be capable of forming a scheme for such a union, and be able to execute it in such a manner, as it has subsisted for ages, and appears indissoluble, and yet that a like union should be impracticable for ten or a dozen English colonies, to whom it is more necessary and must be more advantageous, and who cannot be supposed to want an equal understanding of their interest." B. Franklin to Mr. Parker, March 20, 1751, in John Bigelow, ed, "The Complete Words of Benjamin Franklin," New York, G.P. Puttnam's Sons, 1887, II, p. 219

[99] Cohen, "Americanizing the White Man," The American Scholar, XXI, No. 2 1952

[100] Both Verses from "We put the Feathers on" in R.P. Tristam Coffin, Primer for America, N.Y. MacMillan Co., 1943, p. 54-55

[101] Wayne Dennis "The Hopi Child," N.Y. John Wiley 1965, Robert J. Havighurst & Bernice Neugarten; "American Indian & White Children," Chicago; Univ. of Chicago Press, 1955

[102] Mariam Cridley, Indian of Today, 3rd Edition, Chicago: Indian Council Fire, 1960

[103] Testimony states that it has not been unusual for Indians to find that upon personal inquiry, all vacant units have already been filled or that rent payments turn out to be substantially higher than originally expected once the Indian person begins negotiations for housing.

[104] See Tables on Family Characteristics and Family Composition

[105] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *1970 Census of the Population, Subject Report American Indians,* PC(2)-1F U.S. Bureau of the Census, *1970 Census of Housing Detailed Housing Characteristics, United States Summary,* HG(1) *Detailed Housing Characteristics for the United States, Regions, Divisions and States: 1970, Supplementary Report,* HC(S1)-6

[106] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *1970 Census of Population General Social and Economic Characteristics, United States Summary,* PC(1)-C1 *Detailed Characteristics, United States Summary,* PC(1)-D1 *Subject Reports: American Indians,* PC(2)-1F

[107] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *1970 Census of Population, Subject Reports: Family Composition,* PC(2)-4A, Table 32

[108] "Crowded housing, a contributory factor to poor health, is also one of the surest indices of poverty. Urban Indians experience moderate overcrowding at twice the incidence for the total urban population and severe overcrowding at three times the level for the total urban population. In all, 19% of all urban Indians live in moderately or severely overcrowded housing while only 7% of the total urban U.S. population live under such substandard conditions."

[109] "Poor housing and sanitation conditions characterize the dwellings of both urban and rural Indians. Among urban Indians, just under 1% of all dwellings are without water, compared to only 0.3% of dwellings for the total U.S. urban population. The incidence of urban Indian dwellings without toilets is 14 times higher than dwellings for the total U.S. urban population."

[110] Archie S. Golden: "The Other Poor and Their Children," *Clinical Pediatrics* (Philadelphia), Vol. 10, No. 2, February 1971.